

“THE
EPISCOPAL CHURCH DEFENDED”
REVIEWED:
BEING A VINDICATION OF
METHODIST EPISCOPACY;
WITH

CORRECTIONS OF THE ERRORS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS CONTAINED
IN THE WORK REVIEWED

BY ALLEN STEELE,
(*Of the Genesee Conference,*)
PASTOR OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, BATAVIA, N. Y.

“*idus alterius macrescit robis opinis.*”
“*Eccl. diam placare patos, virtute relicta.*” —Hov.
“*He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just,
but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.*” —Prov. xviii, 17.

—
PRINTED BY
FREDERICK FOLLETT
BATAVIA, N. Y.
1843.

“Dissimulation, even the most innocent in its nature, is ~~ever~~ productive of embarrassment; whether the design is evil or ~~not~~, artifice is always dangerous, and almost inevitably disgraceful. The best ~~and~~ the most safe policy is, never to have recourse to deception, to avail yourself of quirks, or to practice low cunning, and to prove yourself in every circumstance of your life ~~equally~~ *upright* and *sincere*. This system is naturally that which noble minds will adopt, and the dictates of an enlightened and superior understanding would be sufficient to ensure its adoption.”

J. B. BRYERÉ.

“*Illiberate est mentiri ingenuum veritas.*”

BLUT.

A FEW WORDS TO THE READER.

This work, as its title expresses, is a Review of a work, recently published by the Rev. James A. Bolles, entitled "The Episcopal Church Defended; with an examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy, in a series of Letters addressed to the Rev. Allen Steele, with his replies," and is designed to discharge that duty which the author considers to be due from him to his peo-

amount of testimony he intended to have introduced. The ~~d~~clusion of the former will not be deemed very important, in this place, inasmuch as it is not within the present issue. He has said nothing upon that portion of the ~~w~~ork Reviewed which refers to "An Original Church of Christ," as it is expected this will be Reviewed by Dr. Bangs, to whom the matter properly and entirely belongs.

In placing this work before the public the author wishes to be distinctly understood as putting aside all claims to a high literary standard. He simply asks for it the consideration of his readers as a work of *facts*; being fully aware that judged of as a work of literary merit it will be found greatly deficient. The hurried manner in which it has been made up is considered to be ample apology for its many errors.

The author would be pleased to use towards Mr. Bolles as flattering language as Mr. B. has used towards him in the "Advertisement to the Reader" of his work; but not believing Mr. B. is "the most able, learned and eloquent preacher of the" Protestant Episcopal Church, "in this section of the country," he cannot for the sake of *flattery* or to elevate on *false* grounds the ability of his opponent, go so far from the truth. With these few prefatory remarks, he asks from the reader a fair and unprejudiced consideration of all the subjects named in the two works.

ALLEN STEELE.

BATAVIA, August 4th, 1843.

REVIEW.

CHAPTER I.

A full understanding of the matters at issue necessary—the spirit in which the review is to be conducted—the hostile position assumed by Mr. Bolles—defense of religious controversies—necessity of this review—plan of the review.

The work announced some time since as forthcoming from the pen of Mr. Bolles, or rather, as being made up of a series of letters, being a correspondence between Mr. Bolles and myself, necessity calls upon me to redeem my promise made, to review it. In entering upon this duty it is manifest, that a fair and full understanding of all matters at issue can only be obtained by going over the whole premises, and I shall, therefore, at the outset, have to claim the indulgence of the reader while I ask his attention to the preliminary observations which I shall make relating to local matters involved.

I enter upon my task, I trust, with proper feelings and under a just sense of the duties I owe to community. I disclaim any intention to produce unfriendly views and emotions, and have no desire to provoke a spirit of contention or rivalry between Methodist and Protestant Episcopalians. I come before the public, divested, as far as it is possible for one to divest himself, of all prejudices; and in the spirit of liberality and good will, shall endeavor to speak reasonably of all differences of opinion which exist between my own and other denominations; desiring on all occasions to cherish and promote the most extended grounds of christian liberality, and freely cultivating in my social intercourse and in my pulpit efforts, an enlarged spirit of toleration. I shall endeavor, therefore, to keep in “the bonds of peace;” sedulously avoiding an undue dwelling upon those points on which differences of opinion rest, and seek to notice those more essential and important doctrines of christianity on which all sects unite. Because the author of the work I review has placed himself in a belligerant attitude, is no reason why I should occupy a similar position. The task of the Reviewer does not require that he should denounce; he can differ without condemning, as well as praise without adopting, either the language, sentiment or doctrine reviewed; and hence, as I may be permitted to choose my

own ground, I shall select that of a just and not that of an antagonist reviewer. It is because Mr. Bolles has assumed positions and advanced statements which, if sustained, place Methodists in a situation in which neither he nor his people can consistently recognize them—however pious or however sincere as a part of the church of God they may be—that I feel called upon to notice his work.

Mr. Bolles has been pleased to assail us, not upon some speculative point of Theology—the reception or rejection of which is of little or no importance—but upon doctrines which, if not founded in the truths of pure religion, must consign us to the “uncovenanted mercies of God”—must place the eternal salvation of all without the pale of Protestant Episcopacy on less tenable ground than the heathen—must stamp the brand of Impostor upon the ministrations of all who do not follow and observe the ordinances and canons of the “CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES.” It cannot be expected then, that silence will be maintained under such imputations; for however strong the obligations to promote the harmony and social intercourse of all “who call themselves Christians,” there may be circumstances under which “forbearance ceases to be a virtue,” and as a minister of the CHURCH OF CHRIST one may be called upon to act upon the defense against such imputations. Mr. Bolles, certainly, must not expect that I shall overlook his reasonings nor fail to examine the ground upon which he claims to stand, when he seeks to convict Methodists of the sin of Korah, Dathan and Abiram—the sin of being in open and wilful rebellion against God: nor must he expect that I shall avoid the use of plain terms; for though I do not wish to speak harshly, I nevertheless, shall not hesitate to speak frankly, freely and pointedly.

Controversies upon religious subjects, if properly conducted, may be beneficial. I am far from subscribing to that popular sentiment of the age which proclaims, “that it matters not what a man believes upon the subject of religion, provided he is only honest and sincere in his belief;” for I conceive this sentiment, when viewed correctly and definitely analyzed by the rules of common sense, as absurd as it is unscriptural. Fundamental errors with all their evil tendencies should be boldly exposed, and even non-essential differences may be profitably examined. The testimony of Dr. Dick, upon this point, will have weight with all who have studied his works. Says the Docto[r], “In the department of polemic theology, the controversies are considered which have been agitated in the church, with respect to the doctrines, and precepts, and institutions of religion. The term is derived from a Greek word, which signifies *warlike*. A polemic divine is a warrior, he goes forth into the field to encounter the adversaries of the truth. The word has an odious sound, and seems to

accord ill with the character of a teacher of religion, who ought to be a minister of peace. On this ground, polemic theology is often held up as the object of scorn and detestation, and it is loudly demanded, that the voice of controversy should be heard no more within the walls of the church, that the disciples of Christ should bury all their disputes in oblivion, and, without minding differences of opinion, should dwell together as brethren in unity. There is much simplicity and want of discernment in this proposal, when sincerely made. It is the suggestion of inconsiderate zeal for one object, overlooking another of at least equal importance, accounting truth nothing and peace every thing, and imagining that there may be solid peace, although it does not rest upon the foundation of truth. Often, however, it is intended to conceal a *sinister* design, under the appearance of great liberality; a design to prevail upon one party to be quiet, while the other goes on to propagate its opinions without opposition. Every man who has observed from what quarter these cries for peace most frequently come, must have noticed that they are as insidious as the salutation of Joab to Amasa, whom he stabbed under the fifth rib when he took him by the beard, and said, 'Art thou in health my brother?'—2 Sam. 20, 9.

"Nothing is more obvious, than that when the truth is attacked it ought to be defended, and as it would be base pusillanimity to yield it without a struggle to its adversaries, so it would be disgraceful, as well as criminal, in one of its professed guardians, not to be qualified to sustain the dignity of his office, and to uphold the sacred interests of religion, by his arguments and his eloquence. He should be 'able by sound doctrine, both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers.' If controversial theology be accounted an evil, it is a necessary one; and let the blame be imputed to the men who have labored and are still laboring to pervert the oracles of God, not to those whom a sense of duty has compelled to come forward and defend them, against the rude assaults of presumption and impiety."—*Dick's Theology*, vol. 1, p. 10.

To the same effect is the testimony of the eloquent Melville. "Though controversy have its evils, it has also its uses. We never infer, that, because there is no controversy in a church, there must be the upholding of sound doctrine. It is not the stagnant water which is generally the purest. And if there are no differences of opinion which set men on examining and ascertaining their own belief, the probability is, that, like the Samaritans of old, they will worship they 'know not what.'—John 4, 22. Heresy itself is, in one sense, singularly beneficial. It helps to sift a professing community, and to separate the chaff from the wheat. And while the unstable are carried about by the winds of false doctrine, those who keep their steadfastness find, as it

were, their moral atmosphere cleared by the tempest. We consider this statement to be that of St. Paul, when he says to the Corinthians, 'there must be also heresies amongst you, that they which are approved may be made manifest.'—I. Cor. 11: 19. And it is not the mere separation of the genuine from the fictitious which is effected through the publication of error. We hold that heresies have been of vast service to the Church, in that they have caused truth to be more thoroughly scanned, and all its bearings and boundaries explored with a most pains-taking industry. * * * * * Thus controversy stirs the waters, and prevents their growing stagnant. We do not, indeed, understand from the 'must be' of St. Paul, that the well-being of the Church is dependent on heresy, so that, unless heresy enter, the Church cannot prosper. * * * * But the 'must be' refers to human depravity and satanic influence. It indicates a necessity for which the creature alone is answerable, whilst the end, which heresies subserve, is that which most engages the interferences of the Creator. If never called to defend the truth, the Church would comparatively lose sight of what truth is. And therefore, however the absence of controversy may agree with a millennial estate, we are amongst the last who would desire that it should not now be heard in the land. We feel that if now 'the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard lie down with the kid,'—Isa. 11: 6., we should have nothing but the millennium of liberalism; the lamb being nothing more than the wolf in disguise, and the kid the leopard with his spots slightly colored. Such is the constitution of man—and such it will be, till there pass over this globe a mighty regeneration—that, unless there be opposition, we shall have no purity."

—*Melville's Sermons, vol. 1, p. 263.*

Jesus Christ, the "Prince of Peace" declares he came to bring a sword upon the earth, and his word is spoken of as the "sword of the Spirit," and even the Apostolic injunction "if it be possible as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men," Rom. xii: 18, plainly intimates, that cases would occur, in which it would not be proper to maintain peace—when one branch of the Church may so oppressively, injuriously, and erroneously array itself against its sister branch, that it becomes a *duty* to adopt measures of self defense, when not to do it, would be to sanction error, would be to betray truth.

If it is a duty at any time to combat religious errors, it is, most surely, a duty to do it when those errors are mingled with personalities and incorporated with matters pertaining to private differences; and it is on this account that Mr. Bolles' letters addressed to me, should not be permitted to continue before the public unanswered. The medium of the *press*, through which he has communicated, being one of his own selection, how muchsoever to

be regretted, I am compelled likewise to adopt, or be debarred the privilege of placing my defense before the same tribunal which has entertained the charge. Reluctantly, then, I must appear before the public to repel those attacks upon me. If my readers should herein find personalities, let them take into consideration the fact, that I am replying *to personalities*. The necessity for this course will be apparent to every one on perusing the work of Mr. Bolles; for it is plainly seen in the first and third letters, that the whole controversy is made to rest on personal material; the review of Methodist Episcopacy being simply appended and presented as a kind of sequence. In order, however, to be guided by some arrangement in my reply, I propose to consider first the local and personal matters, and second, review Mr. Bolles' examination of "Methodist Episcopacy."

CHAP. II.

A history of Methodism in Batavia, together with allusions to personal, and local matters generally.

Having thus laid out the plan of the Review, I will now proceed to the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this place, which will embrace a general sketch of affairs between Mr. Bolles and the Methodists previous to the time of his first letter to me; as this will enable the reader fully to understand the matter at issue.

The first efforts made to organize a Methodist Episcopal Church in Batavia, were commenced in the year 1816, and from that year to the present there has always existed here an organized branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, though not at all times enjoying a prosperous condition, but, subject to various vicissitudes: at no time, however, without regular preaching and the administering of the sacraments. The vine thus planted in 1816 grew like a tree by the "river of waters," vigorously flourishing and putting forth "good fruit."

The first building they erected for Divine Service was in 1823. The building was erected by pecuniary means obtained by general subscriptions, in a manner similar to subscriptions made for the erection of the first Protestant Episcopal house in Batavia, and which at this time was by that Church in use. The building thus erected in '23, has since been called the "Stone Chapel." For a number of years subsequent to this date the progress and prosperity of Methodism in this village was uninterrupted, very many were converted to the christian religion and became the subjects of renewing grace.

In 1828 the Methodist communicants here were about two hundred. At about this date, however, when in point of number, they presented a very cheering aspect, some causes began operating to their disadvantage. They lost possession of their Chapel and were again reduced to the necessity of holding services in a building used as a school house, near the Protestant Episcopal Church. Here they regularly held divine service up to the opening of the new house built in 1841. From '28 to '41, though favored with the labors of pious and able ministers, and blest at times with some additions, yet taking the whole period, there was no increase in number, and Methodism existed under no very influential circumstances. In fact, the current of public at-

tention to church matters had become diverted to other channels, a few, however, held together in the "bonds of brotherly love," and moved on in the "even tenor of their way" "minding the same things and walking by the same rule."

At different times, the subject of erecting another house was agitated, but no feasable plan seemed to be presented. During this period, which may, with much truth, be called the stationary period of Methodism in Batavia, the old building occupied by the Protestant Episcopalians was taken down, and the present St. James' Church edifice completed. A number of Methodists having made quite large contributions towards the expense of building this Church, became pew holders in it. At about this time, one of the leading Methodists in this village, who thus became a pew holder in St. James' Church, received from Mr. Bolles a proposition, having for its object the assistance of Protestant Episcopalians towards building a Methodist Chapel, which should become subservient and supplemental to St. James' Ch. This proposition involved as a gift from Mr. Bolles' congregation the sum of \$500. I say from Mr. Bolles' congregation, for it was understood that Mr. Bolles was pledging his people, and not himself individually; and this construction is considered a legitimate construction, for the reason, that his individual pledge for that amount was of no value, and such being the case, known to himself full well, he must of course have designed to have pledged his congregation; whether by and with the advice and consent of the same is not known to me, nor is it a matter of consequence at this moment. Another contingent provision of this gift, was that Mr. Bolles should be received by the Methodists worshiping in the supplemental Chapel as their regular pastor. If they would not comply with these terms, Mr. Bolles proposed to give \$20 towards the erection of a Methodist house of worship, and have them continue their adherence to the Methodist Episcopal Church. The first proposition was not accepted; and our people having concluded to make the attempt to build a house for divine service, called upon Mr. Bolles for the fulfilment of the latter offer. A subscription of \$10 was received from Mr. Bolles—his desire for the erection of a Methodist house having decreased 100 per cent by this time—and about \$200 from Mr. Bolles' people.* From various individuals, Methodists, and

*As Mr. Bolles in his work says, that he drew up the general subscription for our house, containing an appeal to the liberality of the people, and represents the liberality of himself and his Church as the principal cause of our having a building in which to worship God, it is necessary in order that truth may be known, to state, that the *general* subscription was drawn up by John Lowber, Esq. dated Jan. 26, 1841—that after this had been generally circulated, Mr. Bolles, according to former agreement, drew up a *particular* subscription, designed to circulate among his own people of which the following is a copy:—

members of other denominations than Protestant Episcopal, a sufficient sum was subscribed, to warrant a commencement of the work, of building, and in the fall of 1841, a neat, spacious, and commodious house was erected.

I was sent to this field of labor in September 1841. The new building, since dedicated to the service of God under the title of St. Johns' Church was, at this date in rapid progress towards completion. To this station I came a stranger, holding neither prejudices nor prepossessions in favor or against any individual or denomination, and having very little information relative to my location. I came, however, cheerfully and willingly, by direction of the Church, and as an ambassador of Christ, not to engender or promote strife, but to preach the word of God and to advocate the doctrines of Him who proclaimed "peace on earth and good will towards men." I came not to enter into the strife of party or sectarianism, but humbly, as a follower of the "meek and lowly Jesus" to administer good to the souls of men.

During the few first months of my residence here, as I was then informed, a tract was put in circulation reflecting upon Methodism; among other matters containing denunciatory statements, and asserting, that the Methodists had not, validly, either a divine warrant, nor ministry, nor sacraments. This tract was placed in the hands of individuals who were known to be friendly to Methodism, unquestionably with a design to create unfavorable and unjust views. This invasion, at the time it was made,

"It is well known that the Methodist denomination of christians was among the first established in this village of Batavia, and that from time to time the labors of their Ministers have been much blessed to the cause of religion and good morals. But for reasons unnecessary here to detail they are now deprived of a House of Public Worship, and such is their embarrassed condition that they cannot hope to succeed in the erection of a suitable Building without asking the kind assistance of *all* their brethren and friends.

The undersigned, therefore, takes pleasure in recommending to the members of his own congregation and to his fellow citizens generally, the object of the following subscription.

JAMES A. BOLLES,
Rector of St. James' Church, Batavia.

Batavia, Feb. 15, 1841.

SUBSCRIPTION, (written by the same.)

We the subscribers agree to pay to the Trustees of the First Methodist Episcopal Church in the town of Batavia the sums severally affixed to our names to be applied toward the erection of a House of Public Worship.

James A. Bolles, paid	\$10,"
-----------------------	--------

This subscription it was expected, by former promise, Mr. B. would circulate among his church and congregation, but failing in this, it was presented by two of our members to some of them, and the amount of \$35 was added, for which we are truly grateful. But it should be remembered that at this time stock in St. James' Church to the amount of several hundreds of dollars was owned by members of our Church, on which they were paying a yearly tax for the support of Mr. Bolles.

I did not notice, being well satisfied that all such efforts to bring into disrepute, and to create false opinions concerning a sister church, would react upon those from whom they emanated:—

“ Like Parthian arrows aim’d as one
To cripple or disrobe the sun;
These vengeful darts, when upwards sped
Return upon the archer’s head.”

Mr. Bolles was the first clergyman of the place who favored me with a visit. I well recollect a remark made by him at our first interview, which was not calculated to produce a very favorable impression, and I now mention it as evidence of the feelings he then entertained. He then observed, that “Methodism was designed to be supplemental to Protestant Episcopacy,” and sought to justify his proposition in favor of the erection of our house, (the proposition heretofore named, embodying the \$500, contingent gift,) on the ground that “our ancestors were members of the Church of England,” and that “there was but little difference between us in sentiment;” at the same time, saying, the *he* “necessarily, was deprived of the privilege of laboring with that most interesting class of community, the poor.” It seemed to be a cause of rejoicing to him, that “the supplemental” to his Church, which was so necessary to carry out the Apostolical commission “to preach the gospel to all the world,” and of course to all classes of people in the world, was so nearly consummated; but most of all did he rejoice in our success because he looked upon it as a counter influence to “Calvinism” and “close-Communion.”

On the 3rd of December 1841, our house was dedicated to the service of Almighty God, under the name of ST. JOHNS’ CHURCH; the Rev. Samuel Luckey, D. D., and Rev. Schuyler Seager, A. M., officiating. This manner of setting aside the building, as one to be used for, and devoted to the “dispensation of sound gospel learning” in accordance with the views of Methodism, did not, it is true, look much like a supplemental to “St. James,” nor did it seem to be announcing it as a “Chapel;” but we had no thought of here giving offence. We did not suppose that Mr. Bolles’ monopoly of God’s mercies extended to Apostolical names, or that we were debarred the privilege of calling our house made *with* hands on earth, and designed to prepare the souls of men for “that house *not* made with hands eternal in the Heavens,” a Church. Strange as it may seem, however, it will be shown hereafter that all these acts were most grievous to Mr. Bolles.

It was not, however, from these events alone that Mr. B. chose to manifest a little pugnacious feeling. An occurrence soon took place of a more sober character which called forth from him invidious remarks. A young gentleman of this place having died, I was requested by the parents to attend officially the funeral

services of their son, and after learning from them that he was not connected with any church, and had been, during the latter part of his life somewhat partial to the Methodists, I consented to do so. In a few days after the funeral, I was informed by one of our leading members, that Mr. Bolles had complained to him of my having entered ecclesiastical territory over which he claimed jurisdiction, and that some redress or explanation from me to him, would be expected; Mr. Bolles considering that I should not have attended the funeral as a clergyman, but that he should have been called upon, because, the deceased had a sister who was a member of his Church. Not being able to perceive any just ground of complaint, and not being conscious of having done any wrong, I did not, of course, offer any explanation or apology to the Rev. Gentleman.

Sedulously endeavoring to avoid entering upon any ground which might be deemed likely to disturb the friendly intercourse between the different churches of the town, or give rise to any discussion among individuals of different denominations, I determined to direct my efforts towards doing good to the souls of men, by observing strictly that form of christianity which is based upon the principle of kindness and good will to all mankind: and inasmuch as my Sabbath evening services were attended by many of the members of other churches, I selected, as the subject of my discourses, that portion of christian theology which embraces the evidences of its divinity; knowing that this was ground upon which none of us held dissimilar views or opinions. While in the pursuance of this plan the prospects of our Church were much brightened, and a large addition was made to us in membership; some of whom had been communicants in the Protestant Episcopal Church. These additions to our number were not made, however, by any proselyting efforts of mine, as those who joined us are willing to testify.

In the latter part of December 1841, an individual who was a pew holder in our Church, and one who had not until very recently attended our services, came to my study and said to me that he desired information relative to our organization. He also, added, that he was an admirer of our spirit and order of worship, but being ignorant of our organization and having been told that it was irregular, he requested information in relation to it. Knowing that he was a pew holder in our Church—that himself and family had regularly attended our service since the opening of our house, &c.—that none of them were members of either of the Churches in the town, I gave him such information as I could at the moment, and from various books before him he took, for perusal at home, Dr. Bangs' work on "An Original Church of Christ" and a copy of our discipline.

Tract No. 4, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was at this

time, industriously circulated in various parts of the village, (though a few copies had been issued at a much earlier date,) and considerable excitement pervaded the religious part of the community in reference to this attack upon the Methodists. One of the members of our Church meeting Mr. Bolles in the street, inquired of him why it was that he had thus assailed us, and, what provocation had been given him? likewise saying to him, that we had under consideration an intended defense. Mr. Bolles to this, replied, "that he should deprecate any defense upon our part," and promised, voluntarily, "that from him there should be no further cause of offense; that he had done what he had, because I had put in circulation, not among my people, but among the members of his Church that *scurrilous* work of Dr. Bangs." The brother came directly to me, and stating the case, wished to know the truth of my being the aggressor in this matter. I informed him that I had only one copy of the work referred to, and that I had lent that one copy to only one person, the individual spoken of in the preceding paragraph. I then related the circumstances under which he took it. Thinking that if this was looked upon as an offense I would remove the cause, I sought as early as possible an interview with the borrower of the work. I stated to him that though the book was asked for by him, and given to him by me, under the purest motives, yet as Mr. Bolles was offended in consequence, I would like to have it returned. The gentleman much surprised, replied, "that he could not conceive how Mr. Bolles should be offended, inasmuch as he never had any connection with his Church, and was not a member of his congregation." Subsequently to this, he informed me, that he had made the same statement to Mr. Bolles, and that Mr. Bolles then commended my act, and said, "I had done no more than the duty of a christian minister to instruct his own people, and that the reason of his alluding to it in the conversation with one of our members, was, that he was at a loss for an off-set to the charge of his circulating tract No. 4."

Following these occurrences, came the reading by Mr. B. to his congregation, on Sabbath evenings, of Dr. Chapman's Sermons "upon the Ministry and Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church,"—in which sermons the ordination and consequently the sacraments of our Church are denounced as *spurious*. A course of sermons on the constitution, government and doctrines of the Presbyterian Church were about this time announced at the Presbyterian house, but since I learn were not delivered. It was, therefore, concluded that something from our pulpit on Methodism, should be added to the list of subjects claiming the attention of community. It was my intention, and I so stated to my people in reply, to speak of church government in the proper

place in my course of Sermons on Christian Theology; when I should endeavor to show, that we were a true branch of the true Church according to Scripture and primitive usage. I preferred to present this in the regular course, though it might be a little out of time, as by so doing I should avoid even the appearance of hostility and could not, possibly, be any ground for complaint. These events bring our history up to June 1842.

In June '42, an additional difficulty between Mr. Bolles and myself seems to have been added to the existing number. During this month, the wife of one of our merchants was considered dangerously ill, and she requested to see me. Though not a member of our Church, yet, as many of her relatives were, and as my family had received many tokens of her kindness during our affliction, I felt under peculiar obligation to visit her, and accordingly, accompanied the messenger—her brother-in-law—to her dwelling. I found her anxiously inquiring “what must I do to be saved?” I conversed and prayed with her, and at her own request I visited her quite regularly and almost daily to the time of her death. She found peace in believing on the Lord Jesus; received the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; had her name entered as a member of our Church, and died in the possession of a reasonable hope, of a glorious immortality. I allude to this case, because it was made the subject of many remarks among Mr. Bolles' people and the ground of complaint by Mr. B—not to me, but to the community—for the reason that, as some part of her life she had attended service at the Protestant Episcopal Church, therefore Mr. B. considered it wrong in me to comply with her request; advancing the propitious idea that because individuals occasionally attend service at St. James' Church, they are, by virtue of such occasional attendance, bona fide Churchmen, and if a minister of the “regular succession” cannot be obtained, or is not desired to visit them when in sickness or affliction, or their mortal remains are about to be consigned to the earth from whence all came, they must be sick and die and be buried “without the benefit of clergy!”

At this period of our history, various stories of a personal character, allied in nature to the party slang of political strife, were circulated. They aimed, not at my moral character, but at my qualifications, and had they been believed would have destroyed my influence as a clergyman. In every instance where an effort was made to trace them to their origin, they were found to have emerged from the foggy ground occupied by the “successional” ranks. At this stage, a package of Tract No. 5, of “Tracts for the People” by the Protestant Episcopal Church, was, by Mr. Bolles' direction, received at the Book Store of this village and there ordered for sale or gratuitous distribution; the character of which will hereafter be shown. The official members of our

Church becoming acquainted with these facts, at the next meeting, after full deliberation and consultation, came to the conclusion, that it was time for us to act on the defensive; and unanimously passed a resolution, requesting me to deliver a few discourses on the subject of our Church organization. After receiving this request, which was sent to me by the Secretary of the meeting, I considered it, not only right, but under all the circumstances my bounden duty to comply. In doing this I exercised no other power than that which Mr. Bolles had done to his congregation some months previous. Accordingly, on the next Sabbath I read to my congregation the communication addressed to me from the officers of our Church, and stated, that on the following Sabbath day, by the will of Providence, I would commence my discourses on the subject. I invited all who wished to hear both sides of the question to attend; as much had been said against us, I wished all to hear what could be said in our favor.

I preached four discourses, which were confined to an examination of the argument by which our assailants had sought to show that we were not a Church—had no ministry, no sacraments—with what success, those who were present can best judge. If I did not convince my audience, I satisfied myself, that according to the claim now set up by the Protestant Episcopilians as to what was essential to the existence of a Church, there was not now, nor had there been for many centuries any true Church on earth. These discourses were suspended in consequence of the meeting of our annual Conference, which prevented my giving any further attention to the subject until its close.

During the session of the Conference, a letter was brought to my house from Mr. Bolles, complaining of the course I had taken, and charging me with having made an attack upon his church without any provocation or cause. A letter of this character after such a series of aggressions on his part, I could not but regard as extremely unjust and withal impertinent. I replied to it, not under excited feelings as Mr. B. would have the people believe, nor in a way in which I exhibited much sensitiveness upon the subject of Episcopacy, but with that plainness which I deemed the letter, under the circumstances demanded. These circumstances, it is not expected those who are strangers to the general condition of affairs here, can appreciate. In that letter I alluded to a variety of facts, with which I knew Mr. Bolles was familiar, in order to show him that I was not the aggressor; and as he had expressed a desire to discuss the merits of Protestant and Methodist Episcopacy with me, I then declared my willingness to enter upon the discussion, provided we could settle the preliminary questions.

After a number of weeks silence, on the part of Mr. Bolles, I

received from him a very lengthy epistle, being about eight sheets. This epistle, though represented in Mr. B's work as his reply to me, is not as there published. In the work it has received various amendments and alterations, and contains about twenty additional pages. The greater part of this according to Mr. Bolles' acknowledgement, had no connection with the subject of his first letter, but was, in fact, a letter upon the argument of Episcopacy. Not being willing to enter upon the discussion of so grave and momentous matter, without first settling the *modus operandi*, by which equal privileges should be secured to both parties, I briefly replied to that part relating to personal points at issue, and declined making any comment upon the other portions until the rules to be observed for discussion were fully settled: assigning as one reason why I should decline until there could be such a settlement of rules, that it was evident, there must be a difference between a correspondence of a *private* character and that prepared for the public.

Again several weeks passed over in silence. Then from various quarters came reports, that Mr. Bolles was about to publish the correspondence between us, and that I had fully and entirely refused to discuss the question of Episcopacy. My letters to Mr. Bolles were shown to different persons in the village, read in social circles, and subjected to the vilest species of criticism. They were read by Mr. Bolles to various individuals and thus the sanctity of private correspondence invaded.

I again wrote a short letter to Mr. Bolles, saying that I was ready to proceed in the discussion as soon as the preliminary matter could be arranged. In that letter I requested to have certain questions answered which I had proposed in the one previous. In a few days I received an answer from Mr. Bolles, in which no mention whatever is made of the questions presented by me: and from this letter for the first time did I learn from him his intention to publish what he chose to denominate, our correspondence. In this letter he stated that the work was nearly ready for the press, and that my letters would be sent me in proof sheet for typographical correction; but that no other replies than such as I had already made to him would be permitted to appear in the work. I had, therefore, but one more duty to myself to perform, which was that of protesting against the course Mr. B. had adopted, and decidedly declining in any way to have any thing to do with the work. In this, my last reply to Mr. Bolles, I simply made my objections, but at the same time expressed an entire willingness to join him in the work, provided each should have equal opportunities in preparing and arranging it, with an express design for publication. This letter Mr. B. has seen fit not to incorporate in his work.

Thus ended the correspondence between us. A copy of my first

letter was sent to me in proof-sheet for correction, which I erased entirely, remarking to the messenger from the printing office, that as the act of publication was unauthorized on my part that was the only correction I could justly make. A prospectus of the work was published, not only in the form of a handbill for private circulation but in the "Gospel Messenger," a newspaper printed at Utica, representing the work as being made up of a series of letters between Mr B. and myself. Inasmuch as this prospectus was a misrepresentation and had deceived many of my Methodist friends in other towns and cities, who were not conversant with the affair I deemed it my duty to notice it through the press, and thus apprising my friends and the public of the facts of the case have waited the appearance of Mr. Bolles' work, that I too, might be able to come before the public on the same ground chosen by him.

Such is a brief outline of the material points in the history of personal matters between Mr. Bolles and myself; and this sketch will, I conceive, clearly establish the fact, that whatever differences have existed between us, the origin or commencement of those differences had a prior date to those fixed upon by Mr. B. in the delivering of my course of Lectures. Does it not establish this truth, that these lectures were merely made a pretext by Mr. Bolles to afford some plausible ground to himself for a complaint from him to the public; and that the corroding evil which so forcibly impelled him to seek such an opportunity was engendered under other circumstances than those connected with these lectures? the propelling passion being that which has too often stained the fair name of many an individual, and blasted the moral purity of those officiating in the Church—*the jealousy of power*. Herein lies the mystery. Herein lies concealed the *vis irritationis* which, under the garb of *injured innocence*, incited Mr. B. to gain an opportunity of complaint against me. In order to render these allusions more readily understood, I must make reference to the condition of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Batavia, for some few years past.

When Mr. Bolles came to Batavia, some seven or eight years since, the Protestant Episcopal denomination was much the largest in the town. It had received accessions both from the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches; from the first in consequence of dissensions growing out of the Anti-masonic excitement, and from the last in consequence of the depressed condition of the congregation in pecuniary matters, which left them without a suitable building wherein to worship. Mr. B. being then young in the ministry, and wanting both the experience of age and of service, and being withal, of an ambitious, ardent and aspiring disposition, was very greatly gratified with his position as Rector of a wealthy, large and indulgent congregation. He possess-

ed those elements of character which are easily excited and awakened. His congregation entertained very liberal feelings towards him; manifested to him many marks of kindness, and granted him every means he asked, either for his own welfare or to extend the influence of his Church. Of course he was greatly flattered and his vanity cultivated to an inordinate degree. A few years of a clergyman's life, when young, and of Mr. B's temperament, only were necessary, to become under these circumstances in an artificial and dangerous position; where the most fatal of human propensities to a clergyman are too apt to be developed and to obtain an overruling influence over his thoughts and actions. These views applied to Mr. B. offer a full explanation of his course, and expose the ground of his complaint more clearly, I fancy, than he is willing to admit.

Mr. B. had thus imbibed erroneous notions of his influence and situation, and under the increasing prosperity of other denominations in his location, became disturbed and lost what little equanimity of feeling he naturally possessed. He considered his rights invaded. He was no longer the "High ecclesiastical of the domain," and held and expressed views and feelings towards other denominations too arrogant for his own good and peace and comfort. Looking thus at the transactions of others through a false medium, he has been governed too much by the maxims and laws of a worldly minded state of society. He has forgotten the truths and lessons of humility which the duties of his office should teach him ought to belong to a clergyman. He has magnified his own station to an Alpine eminence, and from this imaginary and fictitious elevation looking down upon others through an atmosphere of his own creation, has exalted himself high above the realities of things about him, and subjected himself to learn that lesson which he should have been taught in the first year of his clerical studies—"that the proud in heart shall be humbled," and that "the wisdom of the world does not make one wise unto salvation."

CHAP III.

MR. BOLLES' DEFENSE.

His work deficient in order and arrangement—his admissions—articles in the Christian Advocate and Journal—Methodists here as sheep without a shepherd—St. James' Ch. our benefactor—the hostility of names—proselyting spirit of the Methodists—their circulating scurrilous books—the reading of Dr. Chapman's Sermons.

Having in the preceding chapter given a history of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this place up to this date, embracing all the material facts connected with the points at issue, I propose, in this chapter, to examine the defense which Mr. Boiles has made and by which he seeks to exonerate himself from all charges of having given just cause of offense to the members of the Methodist E. Church.

In this examination it would be tedious to follow the different points as they are presented in Mr. B's work, for the reason, that repetitions are frequent and the whole matter greatly deficient in order and arrangement. I must, therefore, treat of the several particulars under an arrangement of my own, assuring my readers that the sentiments reviewed shall be precisely as expressed in the work of Mr. Bolles. By this means I hope to show more satisfactorily Mr. B's intentions; and by noticing his positions separately, to illustrate their falsity more fully and clearly. After the reader has gone with me over the different points of the structure and given to each special observation, he can look at the whole and be the better prepared to judge correctly of the work. I want, that, not only the whole should be viewed as a mass, with all its external parts adroitly prepared to attract a favorable notice, but also that the *internal* points, wherein lie the *defects* and *faults* and *errors*, should also have a *CLOSE* inspection.

Do the facts warrant Mr. Bolles in saying that he has given us no cause of offense? Does he maintain the bold assertion, that in this controversy I am the aggressor? Does he not, indeed, admit, in the commencement of his defense, that he is guilty of one of the charges named by me; that of circulating the tracts referred to? In his first letter he complains of my having unjustly attacked his character and influence by reading to my congrega-

tion a document addressed to me by the "Leaders Meeting" of St. John's Church, but does he deny that he circulated the pamphlets named in that communication? Yet this act constitutes the charge there made against him. All that was claimed in that communication relative to him was, that he had circulated anonymous pamphlets hostile to the character and principles of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Now, although the truth or falsity of this statement does not rest upon me, but upon the "Leaders of St. John's Church," yet, if I choose to admit that I may, with propriety, be called upon to support this statement, I certainly will be allowed to do so by Mr. Bolles own admissions, and, he not having denied that he did circulate the pamphlets named, surely is evidence that should be deemed appropriate. The evidence drawn from Mr. B. on this point, however, does not rest upon his silence in his first letter. The second furnishes evidence positive, for he there acknowledges that he *did* circulate the pamphlets in question. By this admission, then, I claim that I am not only exonerated from all blame in reading this document, but the Leaders are likewise released from any charge against them; because if that document contained the truth, so far as Mr. Bolles' name was mentioned no evil was done, unless, forsooth, "being in the regular order and succession of the Church of England" he claims the observance of the old English law of libel, "the greater the truth the greater the slander."

The matter with Bishop De Lancey is of another character. The Leaders alluded to him merely to show that he evidently sanctioned these efforts which were the ground of the complaint; and when *he* shall request proof of the manner of his sanction whereof they complain, they can furnish it.

Mr. Bolles urges in his defense against the charge of having attacked the people of St. John's Church the far-fetched off-set of certain articles in the "Christian Advocate and Journal," in the year 1836, upon the subject of "an Original Church of Christ." Those articles he proclaims contain "the grossest abuse of the Episcopal Church;" by which I suppose he means, the *Protestant* Episcopal Church; the regular successionist and representative of the Church of England in this country. What plea can be formed thereon? Those articles appeared in a Methodist paper, published by Methodists, edited by Methodists and mostly read by Methodists—they were published sometime in 1836. How puerile, then, is the plea of Mr. Bolles. Because certain articles were published at New-York in 1836, relative to the Protestant Episcopal Church, he was justified in attacking the good people and ministry of St. John's Church Batavia, in 1842! With as much reason might he say, because John Rogers was burnt at the stake in England, Feb. 4, 1555, by order of Queen Mary, for his opposition to popery, *therefore* the Catholics

in Batavia should now, in 1843, be hung for the burning of John Rogers! Had Mr. Bolles shown that the Methodists in Batavia had circulated the articles among his congregation with a view to create dissatisfaction, then there would have been some cause for his complaint; this, however, he does not even assume. It is difficult, therefore, for one to conceive the connection it has with the subject in hand.

Mr. Bolles likewise affirms, that these articles which were "so grossly abusive" "were most effectually reviewed" in the *Churchman* "by a Methodist minister"—(one who *had been* a Methodist minister.) Now, it is well known that the *Churchman* is extensively circulated among Mr. B's congregation, and surely, if the review was effectual, whatever injury had been done, must have been repaired, for the antidote was freely circulated without the poison; and it seems remarkable that there should be so much of the evil in 1843 as to have required the circulation of special tracts to remedy it! But Mr. Bolles is careful not to name that these articles in our paper "so grossly abusive," were written in *defense* by a Methodist, to ward off an attack which had been made in *two* of the Protestant Episcopal papers—the "Gambier Observer," published under the direction of the Bishop of Ohio, and the "Churchman," under the guidance and patronage, and the official paper of Bishop Onderdonk, of N. York. And, that this defense was called forth by articles of a very iniquitous character, of which I here quote a specimen. "The Protestant Episcopal Church, is an original church of Christ—the Methodist Societies are not, as they have separated from the Church of England, without, in the judgement of that Church, having a valid ministry." Now this attack upon us in their papers, had been circulated, before the articles complained of appeared in the "Advocate & Journal;" thus giving Mr. B's congregation the first and last of the arguments, and probably without the article in our paper having been read by one of them. The reader will readily perceive how little value is to be placed upon all the special pleadings of Mr. Bolles on this point.

Again, Mr. B. urges in defense, that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this place "were as sheep without a shepherd." This is indeed a very weak point, and the premises upon which it rests untrue. Our people here have never been without a shepherd; they have never made any such acknowledgment, nor have they ever supposed such a statement could with any degree of truth be made relative to them. They have always claimed that JESUS CHRIST was the Bishop and Shepherd of their souls; to whom they are united not by the "circumcision of the flesh made with hands," but by the "circumcision of the heart" made by the Spirit of God: and in the fulfilment of His promise they claim ever to have had his presence. If Mr. Bolles

designs to convey the impression that they were without a Pastor, he is equally in error, for they have always had a regular Pastor, and had Mr. B. been better acquainted with our economy he would have known that we never leave our people unsupplied. True, sometimes it is necessary, for various reasons, to unite two or more societies into one charge, as is not unfrequently done in the Protestant Episcopal Church, especially in their Missionary stations,—but ours are all supplied with such an amount of ministerial labor as the circumstances of the case require. Our people here, then, have not in any sense been left as “sheep without a shepherd,” and any plea of justification for entering among this flock clad as the fabled wolf was clad, or in any other garb, has no real foundation.

As benefactors, Mr. Bolles urges that he and his people have done much toward building us up as a Church—(Society, I suppose in high Church language I should say)—by subscriptions for the erection of our house, and by manifesting a friendly spirit: hence any attempt on our part to repel the accusation and to expose the sophistry of the pamphlets with which our village was so bountifully and, mostly, gratuitously supplied—any attempt to show that we were a Church, with a ministry and sacraments, was ungrateful in the extreme. Admitting that Mr. Bolles and his people had done much for us, and held towards us that spirit of friendship which one christian people should hold for another, could he be justified in using the denunciatory expressions of the character he did use? Better that he and his people should be open, manly, and avowed enemies, than, while pretending to be friends, strike insidiously hostile blows, aimed at the very heart of our religious structure! How, then, can he justify himself in his course? To plead friendship here is to plead hypocrisy of the vilest and most degrading species. But the facts do not support the assertion, that Mr. Bolles and his people had done so much for us. The whole extent of their offerings by way of subscriptions towards erecting our building amounts to some \$200, of which Mr. B. contributed, himself, \$10. Now, it must be remembered that this amount was not the result of the kind offers made by Mr. Bolles, or of his voluntary proffers to assist, not only by subscribing liberally himself, but also, by making direct application to members of his congregation for us, for although Mr. B. had made such promises, when called on to redeem them, he utterly declined soliciting his congregation on the subject, and satisfied his conscience, and good wishes, by simply drawing a private subscription paper, and putting down his name for \$10.

The reader may judge of the consistency of Mr. Bolles in this matter by reading the copy of this subscription drawn up by him and found on the twelfth page of this work. His remarks in re-

lation to Methodists thus seem difficult to be understood by those who appreciate adherence to opinions as necessary to constitute the character of a true christian. It is singular language for so strong a high Churchman as Mr. Bolles is, to hold towards a society or church which he has proscribed as without the pale of the hallowed administrations and precincts of *the Church of God!* The Host and Traveller of Esop's fables, when the mouth was made to blow hot or cold as was expedient, seems most beautifully to illustrate this part of the "defense." Mr. Bolles and his congregation, however, surely, do not claim that we are greatly indebted to them in the matter of assistance in building and in supporting the Church. While we acknowledge that they gave us assistance, we must be permitted to claim that they have received from Methodists more by hundreds, towards the erection and support of their Church, than has been contributed by them towards the erection and support of ours.

It is urged that we assumed a hostile attitude at the opening of our house. In what this consists Mr. B. has not pointed out, and thus, one is left to his own conjectures. It could not have been in neglecting to invite him to attend the dedication service! for this invitation I gave personally to him and to all the Clergymen of the village. It could not have been in the prayers, hymns, lessons, sermons or collection of that day! for in all these there was not, I am sure, any unfriendly allusions to the Protestant Episcopal Church, or to any of the sister churches. There is but one circumstance left, and for various reasons I think that must be the one which shadows forth the real ground of the difficulty, and that is the *name*. Names are terrible things with high Churchmen. Our house was opened under the mild and pacific name of "St. John"; this name was announced unaccompanied with any remarks or allusions; hence the evil is the *name*—the hostility must be in the name. Now, the crime on our part is not in taking the same name chosen by our neighbor, for that is called "St. James." And can this have been evidence of hostility to them? Our old house was called a "Chapel," why was not that evidence of hostility? Why? because, gentle reader, in the language of the "*Church of the United States*"—the self-styled legitimate branch of the Church of England—"Chapel" is a term applied by them to an appendage to the Church, an inferior place of worship—and this "St. James" was willing, aye, gratified to allow, as it would be highly flattering to have a Chapel represented abroad as an attachie. But in adopting the name of "St. John" for our new house, it was probably construed, and, very likely, *correctly* construed as conveying that idea of equality which Paul so aptly expressed when he said "in what are we inferior to other churches?" This was undoubtedly considered by our neighbor as an unwarrantable assumption. We

had broken into their sacred enclosure, and if we had not stolen their Gods, we had taken some of their holy Apostolical panoply—we had, in a word, come somewhat in opposition to their self-created monopoly of names, and as is well known, we had excited that bitter spirit of prejudice which is so easily engendered and cultivated by all monopolists, and which here may appropriately be denominated the odium and intolerance of the Protestant Episcopal Church: for the claim of sole and entire right to the covenanted mercies of God—of Apostolical power and Apostolical names, amount to, and richly deserves such appellation. If, therefore, any other denomination shall venture to open their house of worship under any of these sainted names, they must expect to be considered as being placed in a hostile attitude to the Protestant Episcopal Church, and cannot escape being assailed by all the various means which may be devised, and if they dare to defend, their very defense will be regarded as a provocation for further injuries. Hear then, all ye of other denominations, of whatever creed or principles ye may be, *dare not to use Apostolic names!* they are, emphatically, the peculiar and entire property of the “churches of Protestant Episcopacy.”

The next point in Mr. Bolles’ “defense” is, that we had manifested a proselyting spirit; and we are charged with recklessness and a want of honorable principles in seeking to build up a sect, not caring whether our converts came “from the world or from the other established congregations.” The Pastor of St. John’s Church is charged, not directly, but in inuendoes, with having taken advantage of family afflictions, to insinuate himself into the kind regards of people belonging to other Churches—of visiting them officially, not for the purpose of doing them good by offering them suitable and solacing instruction, but to make *Methodists* of them—thus, being a “proselyting visitor of the sick.” This is claimed to result from an impatience and “haste to build up a congregation”—an unwillingness to wait for that “gradual and better growth.” Now if all this were true, I am sure there is nothing so very heinous about it—noting that does not, to a certain degree, occur to all denominations—nothing more than, according to its own acknowledgements, the Protestant Episcopal Church is constantly in the habit of doing. In another part of Mr. B’s letter he affirms “that so far from seeking to unchurch their neighbors, they labor to church as many of them as they can!” Certainly there can be no difference between such efforts made by one denomination and those made by another, at least, no difference in principle, for surely, an individual who is a member of a Church, considers he has been “churched,” to whatever denomination he belongs. This is a direct admission of Mr. Bolles, that it is the uniform policy of their Church to proselyte into their fold as many of the regular

communicants of other established organizations as they can. With such examples here for so many years, especially when many Methodists had occasionally, and some frequently, attended Mr. B's services, would it be strange, if for a season, at least, they should show themselves somewhat tinctured with the instructions received from "St. James'" "desk" and practice upon those instructions.

If there is not harm in doing good, where is the wrong in being "in haste" to do it? Do not the Scriptures say "whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do with thy might?"—"that we should work while the day lasts," and as we know not when the day may close, should we not "make haste" to do the duties of the day?

But this charge which Mr. Bolles makes against me, he well knows, is not true; if he was assured it were true, he would have given specifications, and not have sent it forth in this vague general manner. No time can be named when the due observance of all clerical courtesies has not been regarded by me, or when I have put any of them aside for the purpose of proselyting to Methodism. This is only another instance of Mr. B's wandering from, and violating the rules of honorable controversy, by imputing the motives of the pastor and people who worship in St. John's Church.

There has, indeed, been a large increase in membership to our Church in this place within the last year, with few exceptions, however, this increase has been by conversions at our altar. The few who constitute the exceptions, will deny that this change of views is attributable to any proselyting efforts of mine. This charge comes with a special ill grace from the Rector of "St. James," a man who became an Episcopalian as a manufacturer would say, not by being dyed in the wool, but while in cloth! and who has probably, exhibited more proselyting spirit than any other clergyman in the village—a man, whose congregation is built up, to a considerable degree, of individuals from other Churches. Indeed, subtract from Mr. B's Church all those who have been received from the other congregations of this place, and few would be left him, for it is notorious that the greater portion of his pious and respectable members have been gathered, not "from the world" but from sister denominations: and that without the most distant reference to faith or church government. I speak advisedly when I say, other circumstances than creed or practice induced their union with St. James. But far be it from me to charge it to a proselyting spirit on the part of Mr. B's highly talented predecessor, by whom his congregation was collected, for he at least, affected no mawkish delicacy upon such a subject, but by a frank, open, manly invitation to all, heartily received such as were disposed to unite with his Church,

nor am I aware that it was ever charged to him as a violation of propriety.

It is urged in defense, that Methodists had circulated books, such as never before had appeared in this vicinity, containing the grossest mistaitements in relation to the Protestant Episcopal Church; which books were published under the high sanction of the "Methodist Book Concern"—that this circulation had not been restricted to our church or congregation, but, by me directly extended to Mr. Bolles' people. This charge in my *private* letter to Mr. B. I denied, and there. deelared, that no book or books of this character had been circulated by any Methodist in this or any community. The work which I supposed was alluded to, was Dr. Bangs' work entitled "An Original Church of Christ," one copy of which—the only copy in this place, so far as I have any knowledge, owned by our people—I had lent, not to a member of Mr. B's. Church, but to a member of St. John's congregation, and who was one of our pew holders,—and this one copy was lent to this individual at his own special request, and at his own application to me for a work that treated of the organization of our church. A full statement of which facts is given in the former chapter.

Mr. Bolles, in reply to this denial, holds the following language:—"True, you say, that the individual to whom you gave the book was a member of your congregation, and not of the Episcopal Church. But what are the facts. He has been baptized in the Church—confirmed in the Church—his children have been baptized by me—he has ever regarded himself as a member of the Church, and does now, and since the reading of Dr. Bang's work has come to the communion. Are we to understand that every individual who occasionally attends your services, or who, to assist you, has purchased a slip, is thereby not only a bona fide Methodist, but, that he has utterly renounced all connection with the Church? If so the good people of the various denominations in this village should beware." This is a fair specimen of Mr. B's. manner of reasoning. The reader will perceive, that he does not deny that the individual was a member of St. John's congregation, nor does he proclaim that he was a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church; though a person unread in polemics as taught in the Romish school would be likely to infer this. "He was a member of the Church." But *what* Church? *The* Church. What Church is *the* Church? Surely in this case *the* Church is not the Protestant Episcopal Church; for the individual never had any connection with that Church—was never baptized nor confirmed in that Church. "Truly is there artfulness beneath the gown and surplice."

All this, however, cannot be pleaded in palliation or justification of circulating the pamphlets, with which act Mr. Bolles stands

charged, for they were in circulation in this village, through his agency, long before this individual called for the book in question, as a number of persons are ready to testify.

Mr. Bolles says that this individual called upon him for some work which was a reply to the positions of Dr. Bangs, in his work on "An Original Church of Christ" and that he gave him, at his own "special request," the Tract No. 4. This story wants a link to make it out as good as his former sophistry. How did he know there was any such Tract as Tract No. 4, and if he did not know it, how could this Tract have been given him at "his own special request"? He did not know there was any such Tract; for the very language of Mr. Bolles shows, conclusively, that such was the case. The individual called upon him for *some work* which was an *answer to Dr. Bangs'* He left it to Mr. B. to select the work, and thus it was that Tract No. 4 was handed him, and not at his special request. If this tract was, indeed, a reply to Dr. Bangs' work, then there would be some plausibility in the story of Mr. Bolles; but inasmuch as it is not—never was claimed to be by any one who has read the work—surely Mr. B. was not complying with the request made, to furnish a work which was a reply. Does not Mr. B. also, admit that Tract No. 4 is not such a reply in *his* attempt to reply to it, or does he think it a reply, but not one sufficient, and, therefore resolved to reply to it himself "more effectually"?

The reading of Dr. Chapman's Sermons "On the Ministry, Worship, and Doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church" to his congregation by Mr. Bolles, is claimed to have been done without any design to make a defense of their organization, or as an act which should be construed by other Churches as an unkind one. For these positions two reasons are given;—first, that his Sermons are "models of christian kindness and courtesy," and second, that they were read in the *lecture room*, on Sabbath evenings. I admit, indeed, that Dr. Chapman's work is written in a pleasing style—that his sophistry is smooth—his arrogance refined: that his charges and denunciations are accompanied with expressions of regret for what he regards as the necessity for them. But, these admissions do not render me the less sensible of the fact that there was a design on the part of Mr. Bolles in reading these Sermons to create favourable views of the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and repugnant feelings to the organization of other Churches; nor do they lessen my conviction of the denunciatory and condemning expressions of Dr. Chapman. Because one denounces his neighbor as a heretic, and adds that he does it with kind intentions, does not render the denunciation the less bitter, though it may be removing the disgust which coarser expressions would create. This doing of coarse things in a mild way, is too much like the assas-

sins' using a keen edged instrument to destroy one and then pleading that he has done you a favor by his discrimination!

Dr. Chapman's arguments are based upon High Church grounds and embody the essential doctrines of successional exclusiveness; hence, if true, all out of the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church, are beyond the covenanted mercies of God; and Methodists like all other denominations are in a state of rebellion against God. Though Dr. C. fails in his argument, yet this is no evidence against his designs. Where can one find severer thrusts at the doctrines of other Churches than his own, in his 18th and 19th Sermons? It may, with a high Churchman, be a trifle to charge the Methodist Episcopal, or any other Church, with having a spurious origin; to alledge that all the heresies, and all the evils which have existed among professed christian communities, from the days of the Apostles to the present day, were engendered or promoted by us—to affirm that the tendency of our doctrines is to Unitarianism and to infidelity, and predicting that we must inevitably land on the shores of the one or the other—to denounce Calvin and all other dissenting reformers as the patrons of heresy and scepticism; charging upon them the infidelity of Germany and all other lands: but to the advocate of religious liberty and tolerance, one who desires to be guided by the precepts of Him who taught men to love one another and to return good for evil, these evidences of that pride which religious intolerance generates in the bigots heart, come with an array of painful anxieties and distressful fears for the fate of a large portion of mankind. If it be any enjoyment for Protestant Episcopaliens to hold and entertain these opinions of Dr. Chapman, the susceptibility to such enjoyment must be founded upon some trait of our nature which was insidiously instilled into the heart of Eve in the Garden of Eden, and has reached a degree of cultivation at this period of mans existence which even the most abhorred of men should shudder to look upon!

It would not be difficult to show that the arguments of Dr. Chapman, in the hands of a Papist, could be brought to bear upon the Protestant Episcopal Church with greater force and be urged with greater propriety, than upon us;—that if his arguments are conclusive, his own church is in the same condemnation. In fact, it could be shown that the Romanists did urge, against the English Church, the same charges of "division and offenses." And we could throw back upon our accusers similar ones; but this is no duty of mine now in the Review of Mr. Bolles' work.

CHAP IV

Mr. Bolles' Defense, continued—His circulating Tract No. 4, not an attack upon the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Mr. Bolles attempts to defend himself against the charge of attacking us in circulating Tract No. 4, on the ground that this tract contains nothing but the doctrines of Mr. Wesley, and hence, that the circulation of his sentiments cannot be construed as holding evil designs towards the Methodist Episcopal Church.

On this point I beg leave to remark;—first, if Tract No. 4 contains nothing more nor less than an honest statement of Mr. Wesley's sentiments, why this effort on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church to circulate it? Why should the members or clergy of that church be at the trouble and expense of printing and scattering, broad cast over this country the sentiments of Mr. Wesley? Are they so much in love with the character and opinions of that venerable man of God, whom high Churchmen have denounced as an enthusiast, a schismatic, and have affixed to his name almost every vile epithet? Do they wish to assist us in circulating his works, or do they claim that the Methodists are unwilling to have Mr. Wesley's views and opinions generally known? Such cannot be the fact for we are now and always have been ready to spread his writings; not however, as others have done, palming upon the public, works containing only garbled and unfair extracts from them, accompanied with unwarrantable inferences and false statements—but the *entire* works, that the people might read and understand for themselves what were the whole of Mr. Wesley's sentiments. By reading them thus published have Methodists become dissatisfied with their church, and turned their affections to the younger daughter of the church of England? If so, where has such a dissatisfaction been known to exist? Is it not strange, then, if tract No. 4 is in no way at war with the entire sentiments of Mr. Wesley, and if it is not designed to make a different impression from that which would be received from the perusal of his entire works, that this effort should have been put forth? It may be said that the whole works are too voluminous and that few would purchase them complete. But, why urge such an argument in favor of this tract? Why not publish the whole of the two sermons entire, without note or comment, from which the extracts making this tract are mostly taken? In fine why have not high Churchmen

exhibited practical evidence of their faith in the observance of that sentiment, upon which Mr. Bolles dwells with so much emphasis—"I have great confidence in the intuitive judgment of the people when not influenced by special pleadings"?

Secondly:—If this tract contains nothing more or less than an honest exposition of Mr. Wesley's sentiments how are we to estimate the motive which Mr. Bolles assigns to the author of it for withholding his name? Was the author induced to send forth the tract anonymously because he wished to escape the commendation he would receive from those who venerate the name of Wesley? Was this gratuitous and entirely unsolicited act likely to create prejudices and bitter feelings against the author of the tract, by the admirers of Wesley, if the tract was a fair and candid publication of the opinions and views of Mr. Wesley? No, as Mr. Bolles intimates, the author "was afraid of the storm that would be raised against him," not by the enemies of Mr. Wesley for publishing the truth, but by his friends for publishing what was false. This was unquestionably the true motive of the author, for concealing his name. He knew very well, that he was perpetrating an act which from all good men would draw upon him that condemnation and scorn which is bestowed upon the vilest and most degraded character. He therefore, ventured to send forth the tract, as a father sends forth his illegitimate child without a name or any evidence of birth and parentage, little caring how much of the seeds of corruption might be sown by the act. The most charitable inference to be drawn, is, that the author hoped to realize some benefit from those who like himself could feast upon the indulgence of the grovelling propensities of mankind, and thus for the immediate interest which his falsehoods might create, upon the minds of those who should read the tract and not read the corrections which should be made, he was willing to cast aside all principles of honor, morality and truth. Debased and corrupt, indeed must be the heart of such a man. The blood which circulates through his body must be thoroughly imbued with the condensed elements of sin, and his very features must picture forth the hideous lineaments of the Prince of Darkness!

If this tract contains the sentiments of Mr. Wesley unperverted what object had Mr. Bolles in circulating it? Was it to build up Methodism—to increase the friendship between the two churches? If it was to build up Methodism, then the Rector of St. James should be called to an account by his Bishop for aiding and abetting schism. I cannot think it was for this purpose, but that it was to put down what high churchmen term schism, especially the schism of Methodism, and I am confirmed in this opinion from the character of the persons to whom the tracts were given. I notice but one out of the number, now. A communi-

cant at St. James' who had formerly been a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Batavia called upon Mr. Bolles to inform him that he wished a dismission from the Protestant Episcopal Church for the purpose of uniting with the Methodist. He was urged to wait and defer deciding upon a change until he had read some on the subject. The first reading article placed in his hands was tract No. 4. .

A very important matter for consideration is the fact that Mr. Wesleys sentiments are not fully nor fairly presented in this tract. What he has said at one time and in a certain situation, under particular circumstances, is made to apply to entirely different, circumstances, and the whole construction, thus so much varied, as essentially to pervert his true meaning. His remarks in reference to his followers in one country are transferred and incorrectly applied to them in another country. This course, pursued by the author of this tract, shows conclusively that the public were designed to be deceived. There is no more honesty in such statements and perversions than would be exhibited by me, should I say of Mr. Bolles, that because at one time he had never written a sermon preached at Batavia, he had not therefore written a sermon preached there or elsewhere. And this will appear to any one who will read Mr. Wesley's entire and complete works.

But, let us see what Mr. Bolles says of the tract. He says, that "it teaches us that Methodists were originally members of the church of England" and he affirms "that this statement is true and cannot be denied." Now, the truth or falsity of this doctrine depends upon the sense he attaches to the terms "Methodist" and "original." The terms may be used to refer to those only who first organized a Class at Oxford, and in this sense the application would be just, for they were members of the church of England. The terms, again, may be applied to all those who bore the name of Methodist in England and America at the time of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this country:—And this must be the sense in which Mr. Bolles and the author of the tract made use of them: if it was not so, then there is a manifest error and irrelevancy. The author of the tract labors to show—if there is any point in his argument—that Mr. Wesley was so connected with the church of England, that all who were his followers or bore the name of Methodist, were also originally members of the English church. In this sense, notwithstanding the affirmation of Mr. Bolles and his challenge of its truthfulness, I am ready to make a positive denial of the correctness of the application. With as much, yea more, truth can the Roman Catholics claim that all Protestant Episcopalians are Papists. Any person acquainted with the history of the Methodists knows well, that even in the days of the Wesleys the

greater number of the Methodist societies never were members of the church of England. No one can be made to believe at this day that the Methodists in America ever have been in any way connected with that church. Mr. Wesley himself says, his "American brethren are *totally* disentangled from the state and English hierarchy, at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive church; and we judge it best that they should stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free."

Again, Mr. Bolles says that "another doctrine of the tract is that Mr. Wesley warned his followers not to separate from the church." Are not Methodists now, were not Methodists then, members of the church? They claim to be surely: not, however, members of the church of England, but, members of the Church of Christ!—branches of the true vine. And when any clergyman of any other denomination shall so far forget his mission as to brand us with the name of "schismatics,"—"men living in open rebellion against God," "without a ministry, without sacraments, without a divine warrant," we feel ourselves called upon to rebuke such arrogance with becoming plainness and severity.

"Mr. Wesley warned his followers not to separate from the Church." What followers? his followers in England; not those in America. But what does Mr. Wesley mean by the term *Church*? The following extracts from his sermon entitled "Of the Church" will show what he considered essential to constitute a church, or even *the* church. "How much do we almost continually hear about the church! with many it is a matter of daily conversation. And yet how few understand what they talk of: how few know what the term means! A more ambiguous word than this, *the Church*, is scarce to be found in the English language. It is sometimes taken for a building, set apart for public worship; sometimes for a congregation, or body of people, united together in the service of God. It is only in the latter sense that it is taken in the ensuing discourse. It may be taken indifferently for any number of people, how small or great soever. As, 'where two or three are met together in his name,' there is Christ; so, (to speak ^{as} with St. Cyprian,) 'where two or three believers are met together, there is a church.' Thus it is that St. Paul, writing to Philemon, mentions 'the church which was in his house'; plainly signifying, that even a christian family may be termed a church.

"Several of those whom God hath *called out* of the world (so the original word properly signifies) uniting together in one congregation, formed a larger church; as the church at Jerusalem whom God hath so called.

"Let us consider, first, who are properly the church of God?

What is the true meaning of that term? ‘The church at Ephesus,’ as the Apostle himself explains it, means, ‘the saints,’ the holy persons ‘that are in Ephesus’; and there assemble themselves together to worship God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ: whether they did this in one, or (as we may probably suppose) in several places. But it is the church in general, the Catholic or universal church, which the Apostle here considers as one body: comprehending not only the christians in the house of Philemon, or any one family; not only the christians of one congregation, of one city, of one province, or nation; but all the persons upon the face of the earth, who answer the character here given. What is the church? The Catholic or universal church, is, all the persons in the universe whom God hath so called out of the world as to entitle them to the preceding character; as to be ‘one body,’ united by ‘one spirit’; having ‘one faith, one hope, one baptism; one God and Father of all, and through all, and in them all.’

“That part of this great body, of the universal church, which inhabits any one kingdom or nation, we may properly term a national church; as, the church of France, the church of England, the church of Scotland. A smaller part of the universal church are the christians that inhabit one city or town; as the church of Ephesus, and the rest of the seven churches mentioned in the Revelation. Two or three christian believers united together, are a church in the narrowed sense of the word. Such was the church in the house of Philemon, and that in the house of Nymphas, mentioned Col. 4, 15. A particular church may, therefore, consist of any number of members, whether two or three, or two or three millions. But still, whether they be larger or smaller, the same idea is to be preserved. They are one body; and have one spirit, one Lord, one hope, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all.

“This account is exactly agreeable to the nineteenth article of our church, the church of England: (only the article includes a little more than the Apostle has expressed:)

‘OF THE CHURCH.’

‘The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered.’

“It may be observed, that at the same time our thirty-nine articles were compiled and published, a Latin translation of them was published by the same authority. In this the words were, ‘catus credentiam,’ *a congregation of believers*; plainly showing that by *faithful men*, the compilers meant, men endued with *living faith*. This brings the article to a still nearer agreement to the account given by the Apostle.

"But it may be doubted, whether the article speaks of a particular church, or of the church universal? The title, 'Of the Church,' seems to have reference to the Catholic church; but the second clause of the article mentions the particular churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome. Perhaps it was intended to take in both: so to define the universal church, as to keep in view the several particular churches of which it is composed.

"These things being considered, it is easy to answer that question, 'what is the church of England?' It is that part, those members of the universal church, who are inhabitants of England. The church of England is that body of men in England, in whom 'there is one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith';—which have 'one baptism,' and 'one God and Father of all.' This, and this alone, is the church of England, according to the doctrine of the Apostle.

"But the definition of a church, laid down in the article, includes, not only this, but much more, by that remarkable addition: 'In which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered.' According to this definition, those congregations in which the pure word of God (a strong expression) is not preached are no parts either of the church of England, or the church Catholic: as neither are those in which the sacraments are not duly administered." After taking exceptions to this clause which excommunicates from the church of God, for mere opinion sake, he proceeds: "How clear is this! If the church, as to the very essence of it, is a body of believers, no man, that is not a christian believer, can be a member of it. If this whole body be animated by one spirit, and endued with one faith, and one hope of their calling; then he who has not that spirit, and faith, and hope, is no member of this body. It follows, that not only no common swearer, no sabbath breaker, no drunkard, no thief, no liar, none that lives in any outward sin; but none that is under the power of anger, or pride; no lover of the world; in a word, none that is dead to God, can be a member of his church. Can any thing then be more absurd than for men to cry out, *The Church! The Church!* And to pretend to be very zealous for it, and violent defenders of it; while they themselves have neither part nor lot therein; nor indeed know what the church is."—*Wesley's Ser. vol. 2, p. 154.* Of such a church, the Methodists claim to be members, and, I, trust, they will ever heed the warning voice and from that church never separate.

But, perhaps, Mr. Bolles and his man of the tract mean, that Mr. Wesley warned his followers never to separate from the church of England in its national, and not in its spiritual acceptation. This could extend, if taken in this sense, only to those who were members of that establishment, for certainly he would

not warn his followers not to separate from that with which they never were connected! and, hence, all the Methodists in America, and a large portion of those who bore this name in England, were not included in this warning. The warning, nevertheless, in this sense of its application is to be qualified, for Mr. Wesley did, in part, separate, and would have wholly separated had necessity warranted it. Observe his sentiments. He had renounced the peculiar views of a high Churchman,—a succession, through a corporation, of Bishops, superior to and distinct from Presbyters—for he says, “I firmly believe I am a scriptural Episcopos or Bishop,—as much so as any man in England or in Europe, for the” (doctrine of an) “uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable which no man ever did or can prove.” Again he says, “Lord King’s account of the primitive church, convinced me, many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and, consequently, have the same right to ordain.”

In violation of the order of the church of England, Mr. Wesley had established field preaching,—had organized societies—adopted and enforced disciplinary regulations unprovided for by and unknown to the government and ritual of that church:—had appointed and employed lay preachers,—had ordained Ministers for the administration of the sacraments. In all these things he was an innovator upon the order and discipline of the church of England, and in all these things had proved himself, partially, a separatist. What does Mr. Wesley say in reference to separation, in reply to inquiries of him by his distressed brethren, who lived in parishes where the ministers were ungodly? He says, “when this is really the case, I cannot blame them if they do separate”—“I believe to separate thus from these miserable wretches, who are the scandal of our church and nation, would be for the honor of our church as well as for the glory of God”—“a kind of separation has *already* taken place, and will inevitably spread, though by slow degrees.” And in regard to himself, he says, “my conclusion which I cannot yet give up,—that it is lawful to continue in the church—stands, I know not how, almost without any premises that are to bear its weight,” and after enumerating the opinions he holds different from or at variance with other individuals of the church of England, he observes, “and were we pushed on this side, were there no alternative allowed, we should judge it our bounden duty rather wholly to separate from the church than to give up any one of these points.” And again, “the good Bishop of London has excommunicated Mr. Gardner for preaching without a license. It is probable the point will now be determined concerning the church: for if we must either *dissent* or be silent, *actum est*, (it is done) we have no time to trifle.” Pages of similar quotations might be made; but these are sufficient, I think, to show that Mr. Wesley did, in part, sep-

arate from the church of England, and would have wholly separated from it had necessity required him to do so; and this decision being known to the clergy induced them to be careful not to increase that necessity. These explanations, enable us now to understand Mr. Wesley's warning, which was simply this,—he advised those of his followers who were communicants in the Church of England to remain so, as long as their consciences would permit them or their course was tolerated: but beyond this he did not advise them to bear, nor did he pledge that he would bear himself. Notwithstanding this plain inference from the writings of Mr. Wesley, the author of the tract, according to Mr. Bolles, would have the world believe that all Methodists were Church of England men, and that Mr. Wesley had solemnly warned them never to separate from *that* Church!!

"Another doctrine of the tract," according to Mr. Bolles, is that "Mr. Wesley did not appoint his ministers to administer the sacraments." It will not be expected here to account for or make consistent all the acts and expressions of Mr. Wesley, as quoted by Mr. Bolles. It would not be a difficult task to do so, but it is deemed unnecessary and the minute detail and investigation that it would require seems not to be called for. Mr. B's great error consists in his application of Mr. Wesley's remarks to other subjects, objects and circumstances than they related to. So far as the simple question is concerned, whether Mr. Wesley did or did not appoint preachers to administer the sacraments, a reply can be given in a few words; but inasmuch as this ground will have to be gone over again in another part of the work I will now only make a few brief observations upon it.

Because Mr. Wesley reproved a *lay* preacher, who without authority did baptize children, is no evidence that he did not appoint preachers to administer the sacraments? The same act done by a lay reader of the Protestant Episcopal Church would result in the dismissal from office of the individual. Because, in his sermon, he declared such an assumption of the duties of the sacred office by those who were not appointed or ordained to such duties was sinful and the act rebellion against God; can it be justly inferred that, therefore, Mr. Wesley did not grant authority to nor empower any of his preachers to do such duties? and that it would be a sin for any Methodist preacher to administer the sacraments? Certainly Mr. Wesley would not have charged the transgression upon those of his Ministers who were thus authorized;—it was the officiousness, the doing of that which the lay preacher had no right to do which was censurable. This logic, then, of Mr. Bolles and the tract, is altogether sophistical, and the conclusions made, wholly unwarrantable and untenable.

Mr. Jackson, in his life of Charles Wesley, says, "in accordance with principles, and with an existing state of things which

he (Charles) deeply regretted, but could not control, Mr. J. Wesley ordained three of his preachers to administer the sacraments in England, wherever they might deem it necessary; but in a sermon on the sacred office, published about the same time, he (J. Wesley) strongly urged upon the body of the preachers the duty of confining themselves to preaching the word of life, as their original and special calling, and to abstain from administering the sacraments altogether. The three men whom he selected from their brethren, and invested with what he considered the full Ministerial character, were Mr. Alexander Mather, Thomas Rankin, and Henry Moore. The following is a copy of the certificate of ordination given to Mr. Moore, as published by himself:—

‘Know all men by these presents, that I, John Wesley, late fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, Presbyter of the Church of England, did, on the day of the date hereof, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) set apart Henry Moore for the office of a Presbyter in the Church of God: a man whom I judge qualified to feed the flock of Christ, and to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England; and as such I do hereby recommend him to all whom it may concern. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this twenty-seventh day of February, in the year of our Lord 1789.

‘JOHN WESLEY.

‘Present and assisting,

‘JAMES CREIGHTON, } Presbyters of the Church
‘PEARD DICKENSON, } of England.’ ”

From another instrument of Mr. Wesley’s I make also this further extract, bearing upon this point: “I have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke, and Mr. Francis Asbury, to be joint Superintendants over our brethren in North America; as, also, Richard Whatcoat, and Thomas Vasey, to act as Elders among them, by *Baptizing* and administering the *Lord’s Supper*.” With these facts thus presented by these documents, the reader is the better prepared to judge how much credit for true statements is due to Mr. Bolles and to the author of the tract, and how little reliance should be placed upon their assertion, that “Mr. Wesley did not appoint preachers to administer sacraments.” I know it has been said by high Churchmen, again and again, that “Mr. Wesley refused to the last, in the strongest terms, his consent that those he ordained should take upon them to administer the sacraments.” To this continued and obstinate adherence of these successionists the language of Mr. Jackson, to Dr. Pusey and others, can be very appropriately applied, when he says, “Thus it is, that grave

men, whose very office binds them to attach a peculiar sacredness to truth, fearlessly dogmatize on subjects which they never take the pains to understand. Mr. Wesley expressly appointed about twenty of his preachers to perform those acts which these clergymen tell the world he absolutely forbade them to meddle with; thus dealing their censures blindfolded, regardless of the injury they may inflict. With a large class of writers it seems to be now an admitted principle, that they are under no obligation to confine themselves to strict veracity when speaking of Methodism and its founder. But whatever blame may be justly imputable to Mr. Wesley and his preachers, the men who violate truth with ample means of correct information within their reach, should be the last to assume the office of censors. A convicted transgressor of the ninth commandment is ill prepared to undergo a strict cross-examination in preferring the charge of 'schism' against his neighbour. Moral precepts are at least as binding as those which relate to Church order."—*Jackson's Life of C. Wesley*, p. 743.

On this point, Dr. Peck truly says, "how came Mr. Wesley to set apart these men if," (as Mr. Bolles and his tractator claim,) "their desiring it 'was the sin of Korah,' would not this have been upon the part of Mr. Wesley on the principles of the tract 'rebellion against God?' Here, ye wise and good men of the Church is your sound high Churchman, John Wesley either forsaking the order of the Church, or becoming a captain in the company of Korah, Dathan and Abiram! Upon which horn of the dilemma will you hang him?"—*Examination of Tract No. 4*, p. 19.

I consider the facts here presented sufficient to show that this doctrine of the tract, which asserts that "Mr. Wesley did not appoint his preachers to administer the Sacraments," is based upon grounds entirely and wholly at variance with the truth. Here then, I think, I can safely drop the consideration of this point, and will only add that, after asserting, the statements of the tract are true, and arguing, at length, their truthfulness, it is a remarkable circumstance that Mr. Bolles, on p. 29 of his work, yields as untenable the main position of the tract, and acknowledges its author has exceeded the truth, for in giving his opinion of the tract he says, "I am of the opinion that it speaks too highly of Mr. Wesley himself, and that one might conclude from reading the tract, that Mr. Wesley never departed in his conduct from the sentiments which he so often and so strongly asserted. This I know, is the opinion of many, and that Mr. Wesley himself always persisted in declaring that he had never separated from the Church. But to my mind it is *perfectly plain* that he acted inconsistently with his principles,—and this is the opinion of those who knew him best." It is perfectly plain to Mr. B's mind, that

Mr. Wesley acted inconsistently. How? Not by observing, but by departing, separating, from the formularies of the Church of England! And this, Mr. B. says, is the opinion of those who knew Mr. Wesley best. It must, then, have been perfectly plain to the Rector's mind, that the Methodists, in copying departures which Mr. Wesley sanctioned, have not acted inconsistently—that in circulating tract No. 4 he was circulating a misrepresentation of both Mr. Wesley and the Methodists—was performing an act calculated to produce in the public mind unjust and unequal views of our institutions—was circulating what to his mind was clearly and plainly false—what was not merely an attack upon the Methodists but upon *truth*. I have thus noticed and commented upon all the doctrines presented by Mr. B., named as contained in tract No. 4. These are not, however, all that the tract furnishes. They constitute only that portion which it was necessary for me to treat of in reviewing that part of Mr. Bolles' defense which relates to the circulation of the tract; the motive of Mr. B. in that act, requires examination, as, it will be recollect, he denies having any design to prejudice the community against Methodism by circulating this tract.

What object had the author in sending abroad this tract? According to his own representations “to contribute to the tide of effort making for the **UNITY OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.**” But, what is the unity of which he speaks? In his conception it is the conversion of Methodists and people of all other denominations to Protestant Episcopalianism—the high Church unity! Not that unity of spirit “in the bonds of peace and love” which we are taught to seek, but unity in submissiveness to peculiar forms and ceremonies! Unity of hands without unity of hearts; the cold, formal, selfish, sycophantic unity of interest governed by and exhibited under the ceremonies and pageantry of a lifeless discipline. The object, then, of the author of the tract was to persuade Methodists to abandon, what he calls, schism and to unite with the Protestant Episcopal Church—and in order that they may have plausible grounds for doing so he labors upon the special argument furnished by the position assumed by him, that “Methodism is not a Church, but a society, without sacraments—without a ministry—without a divine warrant!” By him Mr. Wesley is represented as being in “the realm of spirits, bearing witness against the present pretensions of Methodism—declaring these pretensions rebellion against God.” “Wesley out of the way, they made for themselves a ministry, and they made for themselves sacraments, and *they called themselves A CHURCH.* Were they a Church? If they were, then may the Abolition society at length become a Church. Then may the Moral Reform society become a Church. Then may the Temperance society become a Church. Nay, then may any number of men and wo-

men who have been for some time for any purpose united, appoint something that they call a ministry, arrange something that they call sacraments and, then stand out to the world as **THE CHURCH OF ALMIGHTY GOD.**" Such is the language of Mr. B's tracts which precedes the inquiries, "will you take to your fellowship the Abolition Society, or the Moral Reform Society, and call them Churches? If you acknowledge one, why not the three." To the intelligent man of the world he thus appeals. "For any secondary purpose will you sustain that which is so manifestly an invention of men? Why not get up a Church yourself, as well as be at the trouble and expense of supporting that which is nothing, after all, but what some other men got up? Can you trust your eternal interests and the eternal interests of your household, to such inventions? Listen to that instruction of the Holy Spirit, 'mark them that causes divisions and avoid them.'" Now, it is most remarkable that any clergyman could use such language. This spirit of denunciation is indeed a most bigoted spirit. It seems as if the heart of man could become as cold and selfish in bigotry as the most degraded and debased of fallen spirits. What a grovelling conception this, that all other churches are but of men's inventions, than the Protestant Episcopal Church which, I suppose, is claimed to be purely of God's invention! nothing of the *world* is, around or about it—all purity in its attributes! What blasphemy! What fanaticism! He who can thus denounce all other Churches—who can thus advise Methodists and people of other denominations to shun the altars they have erected upon which to offer their worship to the ever living God, "as they would avoid final condemnation," both from God and the founders of their sects, must have a heart so sunken in the mire of unrighteousness, as that its own corruption would sink it to the deepest recesses of perdition. The ancient representation, of an animal having the form of a beast with the face and breast of man, was, indeed, it seems, founded upon something more than mere fable. It is painful to be obliged to acknowledge that this age, which has been strenuously claimed to be the enlightened age, should give such conclusive illustration of that symbolical monster.

To the inquiry, "what has become of the thousands who have died in it," (the Methodist Episcopal Church,) the author of the tract says, "no reply is pretended, the human mind *cannot tell that.*" Well and aptly has the Rev. Mr. Thompson, of the Presbyterian Church, remarked upon this closing paragraph, "This is horrible, truly here is a precious morsal—here is catholicity for you—*charity with a vengeance!*" It is indeed beyond the power of man's intellect to divine what has been the fate of the thousands referred to, as well as millions of all religious denominations who have, in the course of time, been gathered to "that

bourn from whence no traveller returns." But notwithstanding it is beyond man's divination, and as much in conflict as it may be with the sentiments of high Churchmen, we will yet *hope* that they now rest "with the souls of the blest made perfect in Heaven." The charitable man of the tract would consign all out of the pale of Protestant Episcopacy, to perdition. To him it matters not whether Methodists exercise "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." With him the inquiry is useless, whether they have pure religion and stand undefiled before God and the Father. Whether they are of those who "visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction," and keep aloof from and unspotted by the vices of the world? All these questions are of no moment to him. "The human mind cannot tell" when they are dead whether they are in heaven or in hell. Did they leave behind them fond tokens of their faith in and patient resignation to the will of God? Is there not one solitary syllable that throws light upon their destiny? Must surviving friends still bedew their ashes with the tears of hopeless grief? What are all these queries worth to high Churchmen? There is but one question in which they feel interested, and that is, did they die **PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS**? Did they die in communion with that Church which the author of the tract recognizes as bearing the essential outward marks of truth: if not, then wo unto them! their sun has gone down in darkness—their path beyond the tomb is overshadowed with clouds! He would permit us to hope for them, perhaps, but he makes our hope, like that for the *heathen*, and in the exercise of his christian benevolence, he would commend them along with Mahomedans and Pagans to the uncovenanted mercies of God! But his charity could do no more. This is indeed a horrible picture, and, I wish I could add, it is the only and solitary exhibition of folly and fanaticism which by them has been displayed.—*Thompson.*

A few words more before concluding this chapter. It is stated in the tract, that "when Mr. Wesley died and went away to the invisible world, he did not leave, neither was there such a thing known on the earth as a Methodist CHURCH." This is a statement which every one conversant with the history of Methodism knows to be false. I will not say of Mr. Bolles, when he adopted this sentence, as he once said to one of the Leaders of St. John's Church, of Dr. Bangs in reference to a certain paragraph of the Doctors, that "it is a lie, a big lie, and Doctor Bangs knew it to be a lie when he wrote it," for this would be vulgar and moreover uncharitable, to say Mr. Bolles knew this assertion to be false, as I really think, and few will differ from me, that the Rector is not over conversant with Methodism, or he would scarcely have admitted to his appendix that long, prosy, and stupidly foolish letter of his anonymous correspondent on Methodist Discipline.

The Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in 1784. Mr. Wesley died 1791, seven years thereafter. And yet bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church by writing, publishing and circulating this tract, tacitly endorse this palpable falsehood, 'that "when Wesley died there was no organization claiming to be a Methodist Church!?"' These are some of the doctrines of this tract (No. 4) which Mr. Bolles did not see fit to notice. Let the reader review these doctrines, keeping in mind the fact, that these tracts were given to persons who were either not members of any Church, but inclined to Methodism, or were members of his own Church, and contemplated becoming Methodists, and then decide whether by his circulating pamphlets of this character among such persons, he is not guilty of an attempt to prejudice individuals against Methodism.

And as he avers his belief, that the author of the tract has sustained his positions, viz. "that the Methodists are not a Church—have no ministry—no sacraments—no divine warrant: are guilty of the sin of Korah—are living in open rebellion against God—have no good hope of heaven—that the fellowship the Protestant Episcopal Church should have for us is, the same they should have for the Moral Reform, Abolition and Temperance Societies," we thus know, and this community will know how to appreciate his professions of love to us—his frequent remarks in social circles to the members of our Church that we are alike in all essentials and nearly so in non-essentials. Whether such a course of action is analogous to the jesuitism of Rome, or consistent with christian candor, and how near it approaches to the spirit of Bishop Horsly, so piously put forth in Mr. B's first letter, the student in ecclesiastical history will be able to judge.

CHAP. V

Mr. Bolles defense continued. His circulating tract No. 5 not an attack upon the Methodists—the tracts anonymous—his charge that I, not himself, had left tract No. 4 at the Book Store.

I proceed in my review of Mr. B's defense; and now ask the attention of the reader to the consideration of that part which relates to his circulation of "tract No. 5," of "tracts for the people." In this act, Mr. B. claims that he made no attack upon us, and that Methodists should not, on this account, hold any grievance against him, for the reason, that the tract contained nothing more than the faith of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By this statement Mr. B. would convey the idea, I presume, that his knowledge of Methodism exceeded that of the author of the tract, for while acting on the same ground with him, and pleading fair designs, he steps beyond the path made by him. The author of the tract does not assert that he was advocating the doctrines of our Church; on the contrary, he avers, "that his position was not only *against* Presbyterians ordinarily so called, but, also, *against* Baptists, **METHODISTS**," &c. Here it will be perceived, that Mr. B. in his effort to free himself from the allegation of the "Leaders Meeting" is brought in conflict with the assertions of the author of the tract. Is not this absolutely so? Let us notice the position maintained in the tract.

From the general bearing and structure of his argument it is evident, that the author of tract No. 5 wished to prove, that there was but ONE *true* Church, and which could only be so by having three distinct orders created by divine authority, with the right or power of ordination restricted to the first and superior order, without which three distinct orders thus constituted, there could not be a true Church. It will appear that I have stated his positions correctly from this quotation in which he says, that "in the Apostolic period of the Church, as in the Jewish period, the divinely established and only authorized ministry, was constituted in three distinct orders: to the first of these orders, alone, belonged the high powers of ordination, government and discipline. And these three orders were intended to be and actually were continued as permanent orders perpetuated by successive ordinations"—"this divinely constituted ministry is necessary to our covenant with God in Christ, being the official seals of that covenant; and the covenant is necessary to convey and assure to us the pardon and

promises of the Gospel. Without an authorised ministry, then, there are no sacraments—without the sacraments there is no covenant, no Church; and out of the Church there is no promise of God's mercy and favor, no pledge, no assurance of salvation." He then proceeds in his endeavors to show, that none but a ministry thus constituted, "have a right, to impart to us the LIFE GIVING sacraments, and to feed us with the '*true bread which came down from heaven.*'" "Where this ministry is not found," he adds, "there is no ministerial authority—there are no sacraments—there is no Church; and all men who are, unhappily, destitute of them, whatever they may believe or profess, and whatever forms of religion and religious observances they may adopt, are aliens from the holy covenant, to which they have not been authoritatively admitted." The consideration of *these* subjects he states, comes "within the circle of his present theme."

Whether he sustained his positions I will not now stop to inquire, but that he had these subjects under consideration, is further evident from what he thus says, "the evidence furnished is clear, pointed, conclusive—sufficient to convince the impartial, candid and christian reader." And, again, he adds, that "what he had adduced was only a specimen of what fills all antiquity." That Mr. B. deemed these positions sustained is presumed from his assertion, "that he" (the author) "had presented such proofs as could not be overthrown;" though his arguments had all been exploded for the ninety-ninth time, long before the tract was written, or the veritable endorser of its sentiments saw the light of day.

Having, in his own opinion, sustained his position, the author advances to the work of excommunication; not, indeed, in his own language, (nevertheless he is none the less guilty,) but in the adopted "significant language of others," which consists of quotations from some of the fathers, embodying such inferences as he wished to exhibit. Thus he, by such quotations, says "as many as are of God and of Christ are also with their bishop. If any one follow them who make a schism in the Church, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Hearken to the bishop, that God also may hearken unto you. Being subject to your bishop and the presbytery you may be holy and thoroughly sanctified. They who do not come to the Church do not partake of the spirit, but deprive themselves of life; for where the Church is, there is the spirit of God. Those who tear and divide the unity of the Church receive from God the same punishment as Jeroboam. Whosoever separates himself from the Church, declares himself an alien and cuts himself off from the inheritance which the Church promises. He cannot obtain the reward which Jesus Christ gives, who leaves the Church which Jesus Christ has established; he is an alien; he is impure; he is an enemy. God

is no more our father when we cease to be children of the Church. He cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother. Think you that any one can stand and live who retires from the Church and forms for himself other habitations and a different home. Whoever is separated from the Catholic Church * * the wrath of God abideth on him." These doctrines are presented, and declared to be those, which "were held and taught by the whole ancient church."

Under this view of tract No. 5, it seems that its author designed to place and, in his opinion has succeeded in placing, Methodism without the pale of the true Church; and has supported his charge against Methodists of having no inheritance in the kingdom of God, yea more, of having now "the wrath of God abiding on them." Let it be remembered that such is *his own* inference. How, then, can it be said that this tract is not calculated, and was not designed to injure the Methodist Episcopal Church? How can it be said that the doctrines of the tract are not the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but only those doctrines as understood by an individual member of that Church? To such constructive pleas Mr. Bolles has already barred himself a resort by assuring us, that the object of the tract was "to prove the three orders of the ministry *as held* by the Protestant Episcopal Church?" Let it not be said hereafter that Mr. B. and his "successional" associate "never pronounced the uncharitable sentence of condemnation," for here, in a tract written for the express purpose of expounding and supporting doctrines *as held* by their Church; in a work duly credited by their paper, and introduced by Mr. B. into this community—not by the half dozen but half hundred—and gratuitously circulated, such "uncharitable sentences" abound, and Methodists as well as nineteen-twentieths of professed Church members in christendom, are pronounced to have "no inheritance in the kingdom of God—no sacraments—no covenant—no promise of God's mercy—no pledge, no assurance of salvation;" but to have "the wrath of God abiding on them."

The only evidence adduced by Mr. B. in support of the assertion that tract No. 5 truly displays the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is drawn from that part of our Book of Discipline which embraces our ordination service. Here he has fallen into the same error which others have before him, and which is but one of the many contained in his letters, and either exhibits ignorance or deceit, which of the two he may decide for himself. The charge which he here makes, is, that our "forms of ordination" are copied from the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Now Mr. Bolles may or may not know, that this Prayer Book was not in existence at the time our Church adopted her forms of ordination. If he does not know it he is ignor-

ant of this point of Ecclesiastical History—if he did know it he is guilty of an absolute falsehood: which will he admit to be the fact? I will not alledge that the Protestant Episcopal forms of ordination are taken from ours, for I presume, both received the leading and important features from the same source, each making such modifications and alterations as seemed necessary to answer their own special purposes. If Mr. B. should not be aware of certain facts relative to these forms and other matters connected therewith, he may learn them from the works of Bishop Burnet; one of which he will find affords satisfactory information that the ordination service of the Protestant Episcopal Church as contained in her Prayer Book, is not there as it was in the ordaining service of the Church of England prior to 1662.

At this time the Prayer Book contains a special service for the ordaining of a Bishop to distinguish him from a Priest; at the date of 1662 no such difference existed; and hence, the terms “receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest,” and “receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop” have been added. There is also a difference with regard to the lessons. Those passages which relate to the duties of a scriptural Bishop were then applied to a Presbyter. How is all this? Can it be inferred from these facts that prior to 1662 the Church was Presbyterian. But more of this hereafter. The simple questions to be considered here are, do the forms of ordination, as found in our book of discipline, prove that we ordain ministers under the name of Bishops, claiming for them under that title, an *order*, by divine right, distinct from and superior to Presbyters: which order alone has the right to perpetuate its own and the two lower orders? And do we also claim, that without these three orders regularly constituted and handed down in “succession,” there can be “no Church, no ministry, no sacraments,” &c.? These are the questions, according to the argument of Mr. Bolles; for these are the points at issue, and the orders named and embraced within those points in tract No. 5.

Now, do we believe in these distinct orders of Ministers and do we ordain to them? This can easily be decided by the standard authors on Methodism in the negative: but as Mr. B. might be unwilling to admit such evidence as conclusive, and as fully illustrating our faith, I will refer him to testimony from another source, and Mr. Bolles will not then be able to repeat, his protestation against any argument founded upon our writers as he has thus done in his letter, “not what Dr. Bangs says, nor any individual among your number may say.” What is the language of our Book of Discipline, where the different officers of our Church have their powers and work defined? Its language clearly shows that we do not claim to have any such distinction of orders as is represented in tract No. 5,—no superior powers held and exer-

cised by Bishops as a third *order* by divine right. What is the legitimate construction of our Discipline on the subject? Surely none other than places this third consecration upon the ground of an Ecclesiastical arrangement, “for the order, peace, unity and good governance of the Church?” This is the correct construction, and avows similar sentiments, according to Dr. Samuel Miller, with nineteen out of twenty of all the Episcopalian in Great Britain and the United States. It is simply a matter of human expediency—not of divine appointment!—proper for the perfection of the discipline of the Church, but not as tract No. 5 maintains, a *sine qua non* to its existence. This I hold is the true construction relative to our faith as touching the office of a Bishop, and the same as is supported by primitive usages, and the indubitable testimony of Christian Fathers and the old reformers.

If our forms of ordination imply such belief as it is contended they do by Mr. Bolles, then is the Protestant Episcopal Church placed in a fearful position, and Mr. B. is found urging against her the high crimes of believing that neither of the acts of ordination confer any power at all; and, that, therefore, every order of the Ministry is a mere nullity and ordaining an idle ceremony,—a solemn mockery; that it is unnecessary to make a man a Minister in the Church of God; that her leading divines have been found admitting the power and authority of self-constituted teachers: that in direct violation of the spirit of their ordination, of their vows and their prayers, as prepared in their formularies of devotion, they have acknowledged themselves Presbyterian in faith and hence should have received Presbyterian ordination: for Mr. B. says, to submit to ordination under these forms without believing in the divine right of these three orders, as named in tract No. 5, is to be guilty of all these “high crimes and misdemeanors.” Now as it is evident “so far as can be learned from the most respectable writings and other authentic sources of information” that not more than one part out of twenty in the Protestant Episcopal Church believe in the divine right claimed by tract No. 5—taking our date prior to the Oxford tract excitement Mr. Bolles will see the propriety of extending the application of the following, which are his own, sympathetic strains to the members of his own household. “We think, that the use of such a service, and such prayers, without intending what they mean, or believing what they say is, a most dangerous practice, and one against which, we feel most solemnly bound to lift up our warning voice in notes of tenderness and love; and we beseech you, therefore, to reflect upon the consequences should they rise up in the judgment to condemn you.” Such timely admonitions may arouse them to a sense of the profanation and hypocrisy, of which, according to Mr. Bolles’ reasons, they have been guilty.

No one can read that part of Ecclesiastical History which speaks of the days of the Martyrs and Reformers, and claim with any degree of propriety, that it is evident, that such men as Cranmer, Ridley and Hooper believed in the divine right of a third order in the Ministry as asserted by tract No. 5,—indeed it cannot be shown that such claim is even sanctioned by the prefatory remarks to the ordination service contained in the Protestant Episcopal Prayer Book. On the contrary it will be found that “Archbishops Cranmer, Grindal, Whitgift, Leighton and Tillotson, and Bishops Jewel, Reynolds, Burnet and Croft, Drs. Whitaker and Stillingfleet” and a host of “the most learned and pious divines of the Church of England, from the Reformation down to the present day,” did not believe in the divine right claimed by the tract—they placed Episcopacy on the ground of human expediency and not upon divine appointment! It will likewise be found that “Bishops Hall, Downham, Bancroft, Andrews and Forbes, Archbishop Usher, the learned Chillingworth, Archbishop Wake, Bishop Hoadly and many more” decided against the indisputable necessity of Episcopacy to the *existence* of a Church, though they grant the necessity of it to the *perfection* of a Church. If reference be made to the preface of the Ordination service of the Protestant Episcopal Church, these words will be found—“It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles time, there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;” and it seems they are the same as existed in King Edward’s ordinal, they have, therefore, the same *interpretation*, “for there is nothing declared to the contrary in the revision of 1662. The question, then can only be as to the meaning attached by the Reformers to the term *order*. The fathers used it for a distinction of persons in the Church possessing equal powers by *divine right* as Gospel Ministers. The Reformers were familiar with the writings of the fathers. The proper interpretation of their language, then, is, that from the Apostles times *such distinctions* as Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons had existed; NOT that the office or duties of a Bishop were by *divine institution* incompatible with the office of a Presbyter as a Presbyter; for they expressly affirmed the contrary.” To this testimony of Mr. Powell can be added that of Bishop Hoadly, as quoted by Bishop White. The latter says, that, “with evident propriety he (Bishop Hoadly) remarks, that the service pronounces *no such thing* as three orders of divine appointment.” What is the language of the preface, it says “that from the Apostles time, there have been, in Christ’s Church, these orders of Ministers, Bishops, Priests and Deacons.” This is quite different from what is claimed in the tract! that there have been in Christ’s Church, from the Apostle’s time, by *divine appointment*, these three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons! Now that it

was the sentiment of the tract, and not the sentiment of the preface, that was in Mr. Bolles' mind at the time he penned the paragraph upon which these comments are made is evident from the incorrectness of the quotation. "The same distinction" says Bishop White, "is accurately drawn and fully proved by Stillingfleet in the Irenicum." If then, in our ordination, Mr. B. has convicted us of hypocrisy and profanation, I think it has been made to appear that he has placed a large portion of his own people in the same fearful predicament: and we may be permitted to say, in the language of Bishop White, "it is no small consolation derived from being found in company so respectable." But, I will not press further a point that must involve him, in such serious domestic trouble, and will now return to our Book of Discipline.

I enter the plea of not guilty to Mr. B's charge, and while I do this I assert, without hesitation, that there is not the least particle of evidence which can be produced from our statute book—acts of Conference, or our standard works, to support the charge; but that all of these with common sense are against such a construction of our Ordination Service. And inasmuch as Mr. B. has said, that no individual or body of men can be responsible for the inferences which others may draw from their doctrines, and, that we have no right to charge upon them inferences of our own, or to misrepresent the real doctrines which they teach, I cannot do better than to recommend to Mr. Bolles the due consideration of such just remarks. Reflection may induce him to quote his own language, "Is this the dictate of christian love? Is this the kindness of brethren in Christ? Is this the way to convince us of our error or our sin? Nay more, is it morally honest to charge the Church with doing that which she never has done?"

It would seem, therefore, that our escape from the horns of Mr. B's dilemma, is quite easily accomplished; for though I do not admit that Mr. Wesley with those associated with him, had no right to ordain Dr. Coke a *Scriptural* Bishop, but assert the contrary, yet, I aver that we have not, nor have ever claimed to have, three *such orders* as tract No. 5 assumes to be indispensably necessary to the existence of a Church. This dilemma reminds one of the advice given by a friend to a controversialist whom he feared would be worsted in the conflict "only be sure and throw dirt enough for some will stick," Mr. B. seems to have acted under this advice, and having no other resource or expedient has stirred up the dust, which on being brushed away shows his dilemma a hornless one, upon which, notwithstanding his permission, one will find a horn wanting to hang upon.

This fully shows, that Mr. B. has been arguing upon false, or rather, upon assumed premises which on examination are found

to be without any foundation. He has drawn inferences from our formularies of devotion which are entirely erroneous, and, judged of by his own rules he has violated the laws of honorable controversy. His course clearly exhibits the evils which result from a vain and conceited opinion, hastily and imprudently formed, upon subjects with which one has but little acquaintance. Mr. Bolles not only shows his ignorance upon this subject, but he adds impudence to that ignorance by calling in question our motives and impugning our sincerity in our prayers. From this method of controversy all honorable men would turn away with disgust. No reasonable man would dare to denounce others upon their motives and opinions, formed, not by the expressed positions of those who hold the opinions and display the motives, but upon inferences formed by the censor himself. This is, indeed, a most pitiable course and one which followed by a high Churchman, shows that the term has been badly applied to him; for while he bears the name of *high*, he gives voluntary testimony that he can be extremely grovelling and low. The condition is similar to that of the serpent, placed by some fortuitous circumstance in a tree, far elevated above the sphere which nature designed he should occupy, and wanting sufficient sense to keep quiet and enjoy the benefits of his location, he betrays his true character by his vain exposure.

It is rather singular, that a denomination cannot use such terms to distinguish the officers of their Church as may seem to them the most appropriate, without being subjected to denunciation by high Churchmen. Because we expect from the Bishops of our Church different qualities, and regard the office in a different light than Protestant Episcopalian do, surely is no good reason why our Bishop is any the less a Bishop. If the Protestant Episcopalian should admit that our Bishop was as regularly constituted the head of our Conference as theirs was the head of a Diocese, would it make our Bishop any the more of a Bishop? Certainly not. Each denomination arranges such matters to suit themselves, and other denominations have nothing, or at least, should have nothing to say against the arrangement. Why, then, should we be charged with inconsistency when we pray for one whom we have placed at the head of our Conference, and whom we call a Bishop? If the objection of one denomination to the system adopted by another, be a valid objection—if the presiding officer of one denomination be morally or ecclesiastically illegal because another denomination does not acknowledge such officer, then virtually all religious institutions for the better governance of Church affairs are null and void. The Methodists would have no Bishop because Protestant Episcopalian would not call the chosen one a Bishop—the Presbyterians would have no Moderator because Protestant Episcopalian would not admit

that a Moderator could be divinely at the head of the Presbyterian Church, and the Protestant Episcopalians themselves, would have no Bishops because the Papists would not so acknowledge them. Now this is the substance of Mr. B's position, and to such most remarkable results does it lead us.

But Mr. Bolles, as well as Bishop Onderdonk, admits that we have a Bishop in the *scriptural* sense of the term; and having one, we, of course, have a right to pray for him according to the Scriptures; and more particularly, for the reason, that we use the term Bishop as it was used by the Church of England at the period when her forms of prayer were instituted! The Methodist Episcopal Church, either do, or do not believe that they have a Bishop in some sense of the term, and if they do believe that they have a Bishop, then are they not guilty of insincerity in their prayers—then do they act honestly, uprightly, and justly before God and before man. Having the belief admitted, (and there was no reason to doubt that we so believed,) the reader will see, that we are, not only from Mr. B's unsupported charge, without a Bishop, but also of not believeng that we are doing right when we pray for him we denominate a Bishop. Thus he would maintain that we are guilty not only of living in violation of God's laws, but of so doing in hypocrisy. Pretty severe sentiments for one christian to use towards another. Our Protestant Episcopal friends have generally been willing to allow that we were sincere—that however great our errors we believed them truths, here, however, we are deprived of even this condescension and, I suppose, we must now exclaim, alas! what hope have we of heaven? They had, indeed, debarred us from the covenanted mercies of God, but had placed our salvation, like the heathen, on the ground of sincerity; that though it was not probable we should be saved, yet it was *possible*. Now, forsooth, Mr. Bolles has denied us even this possibility! This is not merely unchurching us, but damning us afterward—as the murderer after he has beheaded his victim would give him one stab in the region of the heart for effective security. According to his theory we must have such a Bishop as he pleases to dictate to us under the *jure divino* claim or there is no salvation for us; for hypocrites of this grade can never enter the kingdom of Heaven. How much is Rome in advance of this, Mr. B's "Episcopacy or damnation"? Let the reader look fully over this ground work and then decide, whether Mr. Bolles in the circulation of tract No. 5, did not make an attack upon the sister Churches with the design of prejudicing the community against them.

Another defense made by Mr. B. is, that he was justified in the act, or at least was not doing an ill act, for the reason that the pamphlets were "anonymous." I am aware, that his remarks on "anonymous publications" are so constructed that the

casual reader would not think he designed it as a part of his defense, but that it was so designed, is evident from his conclusion of this paragraph;—"Now reflect upon the facts here brought to light and make it a serious question with the conscience whether they are such as to afford a just foundation for the charges which you have publicly brought against me." The reader must remember that I brought no public charges against him. Mr. B. also thinks it a recommendatory circumstance, that these tracts have "no local habitation or a name." He seems to have decided that "all controversial works should be sent to the public unaccompanied by a name,"—that "had Dr. Bangs' works remained as they were originally, anonymous, they would have fallen into merited oblivion before this and no Methodist would quote them as authority."

However much Mr. B. may desire to avoid being identified with the doctrines of these pamphlets, I hold him responsible for their contents: for as Dr. Peck says, "having been copied entire in, at least, one official paper of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and being circulated by the Bishops and Clergy of that Church, we may fairly conclude, they have adopted them and are willing to be held responsible for their contents. I shall of course make but few allusions to the nameless author, but shall consider the attack as one concerted by leading Clergymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and so will the public consider it until it is distinctly disavowed. Inoffensive as would be this strange production if left to stand or fall upon its own merits, it receives a character and an importance from its foster parents which even the writers name would not impart to it had he the courage to avow himself the author. I wish it, then, to be distinctly understood, that the fact of its having been employed for sectarian purposes by the Church Clergy, and not its intrinsic merits is my justification for calling public attention to it and perhaps by so doing wresting it from oblivion."

It is an evil kind of commendation to bestow upon a work or upon an individual, which is based upon the fact that the work or individual is nameless and without location. One would suppose, under ordinary circumstances, that this fact would justly prejudice community against the subject or object; and it is by a very singular process in this case sought to be perverted. What kind of commendation would Mr. Bolles consider it, should an individual say, that his work would have appeared better without a name, or that its contents would then have been more justly appreciated. Some men would look upon it "as damning with faint praise," but Mr. B. it is true might regard it as complimentary. It is owing in a great measure to the kind of food an animal has been accustomed to, as to the value it may place upon it, and so I suppose, it must be with man, both in his body

ly as well as mental appetite. Those who have had flattery administered to them until, if possessed of the usual amount of sense allotted to man, their appetites would not possibly relish more, yet for the want of sense still crave the "sickening stuff" will, I conclude, feel that there is some blessing conveyed in such commendation. Some men can enjoy very unwholesome food, and nature having mysteriously prepared such food for them, perhaps it would be as well to leave them to the undisturbed enjoyment of it: Mr. Bolles, therefore, is welcome to all the benefits of this kind of commendation. Honorable controversialists are usually, and I think I can safely say, always ready and willing to add their name to their productions. It is "the wicked who love darkness better than light" and desire to conceal names.

With regard to Dr. Bangs' works, of which Mr. B. speaks not "with that love which worketh no ill to his neighbor," I know of one only which was originally anonymous, and that not strictly so: for, although, the first publication of the articles forming it in a paper had not his name attached to them, yet it was, I presume, well known who was the author of them, and when these articles assumed the form of a distinct work the author's name accompanied it, neither can it be said that the work had no influence. The fact of its being reviewed by the *Churchman* while yet in an anonymous form, is grave evidence to the contrary. The author having been requested by the resolutions of several Conferences to publish it in book form is surely, no small evidence that it was regarded as of considerable value, and not so contemptible as Mr. B. proclaims it: contemptible, however, as he would have his readers believe he held it to be, he found it of too much power for his controversial energy and strength, even after all his efforts to stigmatize it. This placing of such an estimate, upon works and men as may suit Mr. B's fancy or arguments will not I conceive induce the public to hold similar views. The discriminating faculties of man were not all bestowed upon a few high Churchmen; He who made the endowment dispensed them to all classes with no aristocratic hand. Mr. B. must remember that the blessings of Heaven fall equally upon the poor and the rich, the high and the low, and that mind with all its varied attributes was bestowed on every grade of mankind.

It is urged by Mr. B. in his defense that tract No. 4 was left by me in the Book Store of this Village for sale or for gratuitous distribution, and that, hence, the charge of circulating this pamphlet could, with more consistency, be brought against me than himself. This is truly a remarkable assertion; and, if true, is a most important item in making out his defense, so important that one would consider it to be a matter of some moment for him to sustain it by all the evidence conveniently at hand. This thought

is not apt to arise, perhaps, to high Churchmen, and on this ground the omission here can readily be accounted for, and not only here but in almost every part of Mr. B's work. He seems to know intuitively, what were the views that prompted the action of the official members of our Church—by what influence I am controlled—what remarks, and facts, and arguments I adduced in my discourses in defense of Methodism, though in every instance he has shown himself in error. In reply to his charge of my leaving this tract at the Book Store for distribution, a very few words will suffice,—*tract No. 4 or No. 5 were never left by me, or by any member of my Congregation, so far as I have any knowledge, either for sale at the Book Store, or for gratuitous distribution.* In another part of this Review it will be shown by indisputable evidence, that, the Rev. gentleman himself, was the person who deposited them there for the above named object. How he can reconcile such declarations with the honesty of the Gospel I leave it for him to show. At about the time it was concluded by our Church to enter upon a public examination of the claims of this tract to truth, the numbers which had been about the village, by some hand were collected in, it is inferred, as they suddenly disappeared; and it was then for the first time that any efforts were made by us to obtain the tract. Accordingly an individual going to the city, who, by the by, was a member of Mr. B's congregation, was solicited to obtain a few. He called at the office of the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society and having inquired for tract No. 4 found the agent or clerk rather cautious of exhibiting the work; but upon the individual's stating that he was a member of Mr. B's congregation and that he wished them for the use of some friends, the tract was produced. This is the whole veritable story of tract No. 4 so far as Methodists had any thing to do with its introduction in this place. Whether it reflects any honor upon the Protestant Episcopal Church either here or in the city of New York the people must judge. It is said some men need only one idea to write a book—it seems, likewise, that some men's imagination may furnish that idea. I have now gone over the various items embraced in Mr. B's defense by which he seeks, not only to clear himself from the charge brought by the "Leaders Meeting" of St. John's Church of his having sought to prejudice this community against Methodism; but to show that he has given us no just cause of offense. The reader having accompanied me over the different parts of the structure, and given to each, special observation, is now prepared to decide correctly in reference to the truthfulness of his positions, and the cogency of his reasonings.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. Bolles' Defense concluded. His reasons for commencing the Correspondence—his reasons for publishing private letters.

Mr. Bolles has deemed it necessary to give certain reasons for commencing the correspondence with me which lead to or rather preceded, his publication. The first of the reasons which he thus names is "that he had been *informed* that sometime since I had read a communication to my congregation, relating in part to himself, *mentioning him by name*, and containing such charges, expressed or implied as were calculated to injure his character and influence in the estimation of this community,"—"That I had arraigned him and his Church before the public: had held them up to the scorn and ridicule of the world, and commenced an attack upon them, in a course of Lectures, without giving him any previous notice, thereby forestalling public opinion and denying to him the common privilege of self defense." Though Mr. B. had a perfect right to address a letter, or a series of letters, to me on this or any other subject, and, to the exercise of this right I make no objection or complaint, still it may be proper here, to examine the reasons which he assigns as the ground of his action. What then is the substance of his reasons? First, he had received information, that his name had been mentioned to my congregation by me in a communication—second, in that communication charges were made against him calculated to injure his influence,—third, himself and his Church had been arraigned before the public, and they had been held up to scorn and ridicule; and all these bad things had been done without giving him notice—thus forestalling public opinion—and he had been denied the common privilege of self defense. Here, kind reader, is a budget of serious grievances! The poor man seems to think there is an attempt made to force upon him evils and sufferings as great as those endured by the afflicted Job. What an object of woe and persecution! Our very mother earth must have sympathized with him in his groanings! Now all this tirade and froth and flummery shows how easily the man's imagination leads him off into the regions of fancy. No one in his sober moments would think of carrying up such a list of complaints upon such frivolous grounds. A communication had been read it is true—Mr. B's name had been mentioned is likewise true—but, both were done in a manly, open, honorable way, to

which no one could with any degree of decency make the least objection. Mr. B's language sounds more like the blubberings of a spoiled child over a prick of his finger by a pin than a manly notice of a manly communication. His complaint is, in every way unworthy of any individual who has reached the years of discretion. No one, probably, will doubt, that Mr. B. really thought he had been attacked. It is my impression he was so satisfied from the commencement, and, hence, I readily account for his going about on the Monday morning after my first sermon in defense of our Church,—in which, by the by, I had not mentioned his name nor made an allusion of any kind to him—and assuring the people that “he was not annihilated, notwithstanding the broad-side let off at him to the Methodist house yesterday.” Very much like the vain boy who hearing a report in the distance, to give evidence of his safety and valor, exclaims—“there! you see I am not hurt after all”! Those who have read Mr. B's work will remember, that he says, on the morning, here referred to, he went to see as many of his people as he could, and advised them not to say any thing on the subject: but to be much in prayer for wisdom to direct them, and that he prayed for *me* himself, that I might be prosperous. It seems, however, that his object of going around, was to have his people understand that he was not annihilated: really feeling that I had been shooting at him, when, in fact, I was only trying to pull out the barbed arrows with which he had sought to destroy the life of Methodism. And if common report is to be relied upon, his prayer was, that his people might not sanction or countenance error, by going to hear Methodism defended; and the consequence was, that, in answer to his prayer very few of his Church came to hear the remaining three discourses.

My Lectures were not an attack upon, either Mr. B. or his people. They were simply a defense of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against the claims set up in tract No. 4 and 5; and not being an attack, it was not necessary to give Mr. B. notice that I intended or was about to deliver such a course of lectures. So far from “forestalling public opinion,” it was an effort to correct the misrepresentations which Mr. B. had disseminated. In what sense was this denying him “the common privilege of self defense”? Had he not the pulpit and the press? and has he not used both? I must, indeed, have great influence to have prevented his using them in any way which he desired especially in his own defense. But what did he wish to defend? The doctrines of the tracts? They, certainly, did not need it; for he affirms they are invulnerable, and that the facts of the one cannot be denied, nor the arguments of the other refuted. Was it himself to be defended? I had not assailed him: and even the charge of circulating these pamphlets, as made a-

gainst him by the officers of our Church, he acknowledging it as true, offered no ground for defensive action. What privilege, then, have I denied him? Of what can he justly complain? His reasons for commencing the correspondence are fallacious, and the existence of his letters so far as we are concerned causeless.

Mr. B. assigns many reasons for publishing a private correspondence;—private so far as regards my letters—not, however, as relates to his own; for he admits, that he wrote his with a view to the publication of them. First, he denies, withal, that the correspondence can in any sense, be considered private. Let us for a moment notice this position. If it was not a private correspondence, how are we to account for the following language, which he holds in reference to it?—“Perceiving from your entire misunderstanding of my first communication, that there was little probability of our coming to any agreement personally, I *then* determined to follow the lead which you had given me, and (notwithstanding your talk about preliminaries) discuss the question of Methodism and Episcopacy; and then at the conclusion of our correspondence to lay the whole before the public.” It would seem from this, that with regard to the public character of this correspondence there was but one party in the matter. Mr. Bolles had concluded to make it public without consulting me, without settling any rules to be observed, or even the questions to be discussed, he being in the lead, and his having commenced it he should write on what he chose, as much as he pleased, and then after receiving such replies as a private correspondent might make, he should publish them with as many additions and alterations as he pleased under the title of a regular correspondence, written with a view to publication. Now all this he admits he determined to do, because he was in the lead. What wonder then if I should try to follow in time to secure the “second sober thought of the people.” Is it not evident, that I was willing to proceed to the discussion of these subjects, provided the proper preliminary questions could be settled: this matter of fixing rules however was of too little importance, Mr. B. could not tarry, “the Kings business required haste.” The quotation I have made here also shows, that the correspondence was commenced as a private one and that Mr. Bolles, himself, had not *then* concluded to carry it to the public; for he says “I *then* determined,” when? why after receiving my answer to his first letter.

Take another quotation. In speaking of his first letter, he says, “I determined as a duty, both to you and myself, to take some notice of them,” (my discourses) “but, not hastily, not by any *public* and unexpected declaration of my sentiments and feelings.”—“Hence the letter which I addressed to you Sept. 7th.” Does it not appear then that this correspondence was commenced

on the part of Mr. Bolles, ostensibly as a private matter, and one which he did not manifest his intention to make public. Again he says in reference to his first letter "I did not know what you would do about it; nor what shape our correspondence might assume, nor indeed that it would assume any shape." From these expressions, I think, it is plain, that Mr. B. wishes to convey the idea that he had not considered this at that time a public correspondence. How does this correspond with what he says on pages 72 and 73 of his work? "You must not shield yourself from the responsibilities of your letters by saying *now* that they are private," "for you must perceive that there is no way or shape in which our correspondence can be regarded as *private*." And, then, in an address to his reader, which it is true does not look much like a private correspondence, but, by the by, which has been added to the original letters sent me, he says "our readers will perceive, that so far as I am concerned it was not my intention to confine our correspondence to matters of a personal nature, but, that I wished to enter upon a frank and manly discussion of those topics which are really of interest to the community at large." In another place he states, his only object was to know from me the reasons of the course which I had taken, supposing, that the matter could be easily adjusted; but here he informs the reader, that it was his original intention to discuss the question of Episcopacy; for this is what, I suppose, he refers to, when he speaks of "topics which are really of interest to the community." And this he designed to do "frankly and manly." If he has not done it "manly and frankly," whose fault is it? Certainly he has had the ground to himself, and as he acknowledges, was on the lead. My only complaint has been, his unwillingness to pause and settle a few principles "manly and frankly," and then I would proceed in the discussion.

But suppose it is admitted, that he had concluded to make this correspondence public (should his letter lead to one) before he wrote his first letter, was it an evidence of "manliness and frankness," to conceal it from his correspondent, and not make the least intimation, until his book is ready for the press; and when he does inform him of the fact, decline to receive any further communications, assigning as a reason that his columns are full, and insisting that the letters received must be published just as they were written, *et literatum et punctuatum*! Is this "manly and frankly"? If as Mr. Bolles by his witness says "Methodism is a hodge podge" what shall we call this collection of his inconsistencies and contradictions? What is the most charitable construction which we can place upon his language?

Another reason given by Mr. B. is, that I "had published his name from my pulpit without his knowledge or consent," and hence a correspondence founded on such a public act "is not a

private correspondence," and its publication "cannot be considered a violation of the courtesies of gentlemen." The reader will keep in mind that I complain not of the publication of his own letters. I stated to him that I was willing he should make any protest to the public he should deem proper, that I objected not to the publication of a series of letters from his pen on any subject addressed to me, or any other individual, yea, more, that if we could fix upon the question or questions to be discussed and give to me equal space, I would make half of the book of any size, and give to him all the profits of publication; but the publishing of letters written as these were, upon his part with a view to make them public, keeping me under the impression that it was a private matter, and not suspecting but that he had the honor (not to say of a Minister) of a gentleman, he keeping to himself the privilege of occupying as much space as he pleased —refusing to receive only such communications as he imagined could be turned to his own advantage—to publish them as the replies proper to his letters declaring them to be from one of the most able Ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church,—to such a course I objected as "unmanly, dishonorable, and unjust." It is to justify such a course that he presents the reasons we are now considering.

Mr. Bolles claims to have acted justly in this procedure, on the ground "that I had published his name from my pulpit without his knowledge or consent." Now because I read a communication while in my pulpit, from the officers of our Church, in which his name occurred, is he justified in reading private letters to various persons, not members of his Church or congregation? Is he acting honorably in making them the subject of the lowest criticism, and in publishing them without permitting the Printer to correct a word which happened to be wrong in its orthography? Verily, is this reasoning worthy of a place among the scholastics of the Dark Ages; and had one found it in that philosophers works, who in that age studied so closely on unmeaning syllogisms as to contract a consumption with which he died, it would not have been remarkable; but to find it in the production of a divine of the 19th century seems most marvellous. The logic on which this ancient student fell a martyr is as follows, "When you speak the truth and say you lie, you do lie; but you say you lie when you speak the truth, therefore, while speaking the truth you lie." "You have what you have not lost, you have not lost horns, therefore, you have horns." But let us proceed. Perhaps better reasoning will be found as we advance.

Another reason assigned by Mr. B. for publishing my private letters is, that "I had delivered a course of lectures founded upon that document in which his name occurred; thereby, making him responsible for the opinions and sentiments I was pleased to

combat." The object of the lectures was to show, that we were a Church according to scripture and primitive usage, and "the opinions and sentiments" which the circumstances called upon me to combat were, those hostile to this claim as found in tract Nos. 4 and 5. There was no attempt made to fix the responsibility of these "opinions and sentiments" upon Mr. Bolles; if, however, his circulating these nameless pamphlets thereby becoming their "foster parent" has thus identified himself, with them, the work of "making him responsible for these opinions and sentiments" is his own and not mine. If this is a responsibility which he is unwilling to bear, his only remedy is a confession of his wrong and a reformation of his ways. But suppose those lectures aimed at throwing unjust responsibilities upon him, would this justify his course in the publication of private letters?

Again it is said, that my letters should be published in order that the people might see the obtuseness of my intellect. Finding there was no probability of making me understand his communications, Mr. B. then determined (after receiving my first letter) to pursue the correspondence to such a length and on such subjects as *he* saw fit to introduce, and then without any knowledge or consent upon my part, to lay the whole before the public. If in failing to make me understand *his* communications he had determined to go to the public with *them* I should not have complained; though, even in this case, I do not know what the public had to do with his misfortune of having so obtuse an opponent. How could *they* remove or relieve *his* affliction? But what is not understood, his letters or mine? Not mine, most surely, for he has not complained that he could not understand me, and, I think, I understood myself; at least, I have made no expressions to him otherwise. It is his letters, then, that are not understood. How is it? Cannot the public understand *them*, without their being accompanied with *mine*? Do they need the exposition of such an obtuse intellect, fully to see, and feel their force, or was this accompaniment designed as proof of my obtuseness? If so, then, his determining to lay the whole before the public was not to have *his views* fairly understood, but to expose *my weakness*; and that too after he had published me to the world "as the most able, learned, and eloquent preacher of the Methodist connection in this section of the country." Was this kind? Was this courteous? Let it be remembered, then, that the Rev. James A. Bolles, Rector of St. James' Church, Batavia, N. Y., published *my private* letters, because he could not make me understand *his public* letters!!!

Another reason named by Mr. B. is, that "I had refused to discuss the subjects opened by myself." In regard to the opening of the subject he is entitled to all the honor accruing therefrom, he having written the first letter. It is true, in replying to

that letter, I alluded to certain facts, with which I knew he was familiar, as justifying the course I had taken and showing, that he had no ground of complaint. Had Mr. B. published all I wrote to him, the public would have seen more fully than they can from his book, my willingness to discuss all those facts. In my second letter I stated, that all matters of a local and personal nature I was willing to examine as a private correspondent; but beyond that I was not willing to travel in this character for the reason, I could see no object to be gained—that a discussion of Episcopacy would not probably tend to convince either of us of error, nor as a private discussion benefit the public. With such an avowal upon my part, if he wished to be “manly and frank” why did he not reply, stating his willingness to conform to my wishes, or give reasons why he could not? Would not this have been “manly and frank”? But he chose to suspend *any* reply except through the press in the form of a book, and *immediately* he reported that I had refused to proceed in the correspondence. Now he incorporates it in his work as the reason of his publishing my private letters. Is this “manly and frank”? But even if I had declined a discussion of these questions, so “interesting to the community at large,” how could it justify the publication of my private letters? And how could Mr. Bolles advertise a work as containing replies from me to his defense of the “Episcopal Church,” and his “examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy,” if he believed as he here avers, that I had refused to discuss this subject? His reason, therefore, is not only unsound but, in fact *false*.

Another reason offered by Mr. B. is, that had he published his letters unaccompanied with mine, he would have subjected himself “to the charge of withholding my vindication.” What vindication does he mean? The reasons why I preached the discourses in defense of the Methodist Episcopal Church? The public already had this vindication; for I gave my reasons in my introductory sermon, to the only community interested in the matter; and when this community, or any other, shall need a supplement to the one given, I shall endeavor to supply it “to the best of my ability.” I claim, however, the privilege, as well as the right, to judge of the necessity and the occasion as to *when* this shall be written and *how* it shall be communicated. But, perhaps it was a vindication against the charges brought by Mr. Bolles. If he has brought *public* charges against me, then I claim, it would be proper for me to dictate what my *public* vindication should be. When this reason of his was penned he had brought no *public* charges against me, and hence, had received no *public* vindication from me. How, then, could he have subjected himself to the charge of withholding what he did not possess, what had not been written? And when he con-

cluded to go to the public with charges against me, which course would have been most "manly and frank," to have permitted me to present my own public vindication, or for him, without my consent, to publish as such, what he knew was never so designed. The reader must judge who, in this controversy, has been the most "manly and frank."

Again Mr. Bolles says, that if he should withhold my private letters "he would have to submit in silence to all our accusations." The accusation would be, that Mr. Bolles feeling himself aggrieved with my conduct, yet possessing too much honor—too high a sense of propriety—had refused to violate the sacredness of private correspondence, and hence, had gone to the public with a statement of his grievances; leaving the channel unobstructed for me to correct through the same medium, any errors he might have made; or to present reasons to justify myself before that tribunal for the course I had taken. This would, indeed, have been a heavy, and in these days, a very uncommon accusation. But would Mr. Bolles be under the necessity of *silently* bearing it? Certainly not, for if either myself or my friends had thrown this upon him, and if he found it a burden too heavy to be borne, he could still have the privilege of disabusing the public mind by any protest that he might be disposed to make.

If he withheld my private letters from the press, declares Mr. Bolles, "he could not make an honest and fearless defense." Why not an *honest* defense? Would it not be honest to go to the public with his own statement and reasons in reference to his own matters? Is it mere honest to secure letters under false pretense and to make sale of a defense created by misrepresentations? That it would not have been so *fearless* I admit, for it requires no small degree of knavery—gives evidence of no small amount of recklessness, to go the public with *private* letters contrary to the wish and desire of their author.

Another reason Mr. Bolles assigns for publishing my private letters is, "he wished to meet the arguments by which the Church is at present assailed in various places, especially by the Methodists." This allegation, that "the Church is at present assailed in various places, by the Methodists" I deny, and call for proof. They have never been the assailants, they have no war with the Protestant Episcopal Church, nor have sought any. All that we ask is to be permitted to enjoy quietly our possessions, without being published to the world as hypocrites and impostors. When this is done, we feel it a duty to defend ourselves to the best of our ability. The truth is, the Methodists have been assailed by high Churchmen from the days of Wesley until now. But suppose it was true that the Methodists were the assailants, would this justify the publication of *private* letters? Are the rights of private correspondence on another subject to be invaded

in Batavia, because the Methodists in other places have attacked the Protestant Episcopal Church? If this is the most honorable defense which that Church can make either her cause must be desperate or her defender unworthy of his position.

Another reason named for publishing my private letters, is, that it will give publicity to various facts and documents bearing upon Methodist Episcopacy, "of a rare, curious, and important" character. Here again is a far-fetched excuse. Are these "rare, curious and important facts and documents" which he wishes to bring before the public contained in my letters? No, for these do not embrace the subject of Methodist Episcopacy. These "facts and documents," are foreign from, and disconnected with, the matter of my communications: how, then, will the publication of such letters give publicity to his "rare, curious and important facts and document"? Are these "facts and documents" to which he refers of this "rare and curious" character? It is true the private letters of Dr. Coke would have been *rare documents* had not high Churchmen published them contrary to the express wishes of their author, and in violation of all *honorable sensibilities*; but they had already spread not only these but all the matter referring to Methodism found in Mr. B's book over this land and hence, the rareness of the documents is no apology. But suppose it was true, what has this to do with justifying the publication of my private letters? Could he not in a much smaller compass have presented those documents by leaving out that which had no connection with the subject? Indeed was there not at that time such a pamphlet containing most of these documents together with notes by a high Churchman in gratuitous circulation in this village?

Again, he pleads in justification, that the Printer of his work is a member of my congregation, therefore, the publication of my letters must be right. Mr. B. has a remarkable faculty of making who he is disposed responsible for any act that may be performed. If I read a communication to my congregation signed by responsible persons I am held accountable for all "the heart-burnings, evil speaking, &c. that may result from such an unfortunate step." Mr. B. concludes to publish my private letters, he engages a Printer to do the work, and, then, justifies the publication upon the ground that the Printer comes to hear me preach!! Such logic should make a sophmore blush.

Finally, he urges, that for me to object to the publication of my *private* letters, as regular replies to his communications, a large portion of which had never been before me, "was fettering his tongue and pen;" and, as he could not consent to be so fettered, he "felt absolutely compelled to publish them." This is his climax and that it is regularly reached, from his preceding reasoning no one can for a moment doubt. Unlimited freedom

would be licentiousness. A degree of fettering is necessary for the general happiness and safety of our fellow men, hence, in all civilized communities we have the laws of the land, the laws of honor, the fitness and propriety of things: as a member of such a community Mr. B. has *voluntarily* taken upon himself all the restrictions which such laws impose, without any agency of mine; and as a Minister one might, indeed, expect, that he would most cheerfully abide by these restraints, and thus by example, both sanction, and strengthen good and wholesome laws. The liberty which such fetters permit,—a liberty consistent with truth and justice—I have no objection to Mr. B's enjoying. But if the tongue or pen are disposed to transcend those limits, as the friend of good order he certainly would wish me most strenuously to object. Whether the publishing of private letters as answers to communications addressed to, but never received by, the author of those letters, is within the chartered rights of such liberty, the public, before whose bar Mr. B. has arraigned me, must now decide. Of one thing, I think, his book will satisfy them, that under whatever disabilities his tongue may have labored, neither his pen nor his purse, have been seriously embarrassed by any restraints which the laws of honor impose. Had I been disposed to place upon the Rev. Gentleman those fetters which the laws of our land have made and provided for all such violations of justice, it is quite problematical whether the book I am now reviewing, would, in its present form, have seen the light of day. But, I preferred not to avail myself of any such redress; believing in the old maxim, which says of certain characters, “give them rope enough and they will hang themselves.” Surely, a man who is permitted, without molestation, to publish such a work, is among the last who ought to complain of being fettered. What connection, however, can there be between the apology, and the act for which it is offered? In what sense can the withholding of *my* private letters from the public, fetter *his* pen, or *his* tongue? These are the reasons which form the *quod erat demonstrandum* of Mr. Bolles' defense for publishing my private letters. In my opinion, they fall *far* short of forming a *demonstrandum*. Solomon says “the legs of the lame are not equal,” and so it may be said of Mr. B's reasons for publishing my private communications; for they hobble marvelously. I still hold, that the publication of them has been *a violation of the rules of all courtesy, justice, order, and propriety*.

CHAP. VII.

MR. BOLLES' CHARGES.

Some points already established—I had refused to discuss subjects which I had suggested—I had impugned the integrity of my antagonist by leaving the points at issue—had denied the jurisdiction of our most solemn prayers—plagiarism—historical ignorance—ignorance of orthography—wrong spirit—have admitted that I was the originator of the whole difficulty—had unjustly injured and slandered Bishop De Lancey—had declined Mr. B's request for the manuscript of my Lectures—the Lectures delivered at an unsuitable season—Mr. B. unjustly identified with the doctrine of the tracts—the charge of ingratitude—the effect of misconstruing our words of kindness.

An impartial examination of Mr. Bolles' defense will, I think, justify me in saying, that neither my people nor myself have given him any just cause of offense—that in my duties, as a Minister of Christ, I have not, at any time or on any occasion, officiated where I was not strictly required to officiate; nor have I intruded upon premises over which Mr. B. can in any degree claim jurisdiction. It will, I think, appear equally clear, that I have not been "a proselyting visitor of the sick"—that I have not circulated books of a sectarian character, or, in fact circulated any books, where strict propriety and duty, were in any measure interfered with. Again, I think, it can be shown, that I have not assailed the Protestant Episcopal Church condemning her peculiarities, either in conversation or from the pulpit, or in any manner given cause to be charged with any offense against her; but that I have always, and at all times, truly conducted myself as a Minister of Peace. For the document in which Mr. B's name occurred, I not being responsible, if there was any thing reproachful contained therein, it should not, and cannot justly be held against me: and it satisfactorily appearing, by Mr. B's own admission that so far as his name was used its application rested upon admitted facts, removes all grounds of offense from this cause not only against myself, but also against all others. It must further be admitted, that the sermons which I preached, in reference to which Mr. B. makes complaint, could not be deemed an attack upon him or his Church; but must be allowed to be, as they decidedly were, a defense of our Church. It will also be

allowed, that I have not refused to enter upon a fair and manly discussion of the questions of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy, and their not being so discussed was not owing, *on my part*, to any neglect, but, to an unwillingness on the part of Mr. Bolles to meet the question.

I think it has been, further made to appear that there was a series of aggressions in operation a long time, among which were the several attempts, in various ways, to secure, as members of his congregation and Church, many who belonged to the Methodist Communion.

It is shown, that Mr. B. read a course of Sermons, written by one of their most learned men in which we were denounced as a "spurious Church"—that he had circulated tracts attacking our organization and ordinances and which, if their arguments were sound, presented us to the community as "hypocrites and impostors;" without the "regular means of grace" and "living in wilful rebellion against God." Under these circumstances it seemed to be no more than sheer justice to ourselves—to that branch of the Church of Christ of which we are members—to our fathers, who had gone to that "bourne from whence no traveller returns," and, therefore, could not defend themselves, to repel these unwarranted accusations. This was attempted; not, however, in a dishonorable manner—not by circulating, covertly, anonymous pamphlets, in which facts were distorted and the opinions of others unjustly assailed—not by securing under false pretences private letters, and after passing them around in various social circles, subjecting them to the coarsest and lowest species of criticism, thereby seeking to undermine the influence of their author, and then sending them forth published with such replies connected as would best suit our aggressors views—not by printing such letters under a pledge of secrecy from the publisher; no indeed no attempts would be made under any such forms or habits of a jesuitical school of intrigue and deception: but in an open and above board way, as Methodists are in the practice of doing. My attempts to repel these accusations were made on the Sabbath, in our own pulpit, and after one weeks notice had been before the public—a notice which definitely stated the object and declared it to be not to attack other Churches, but to defend ourselves against the charges which the Rector of St. James had brought against us. And further show, if it could be shown, that we were, according to the Scriptures, a *true* Church. To these attempts all were invited—friends and enemies—to come; and all who were disposed did come and hear for themselves.

These are some of the points, which, I think, have been so fully sustained as to leave no doubt in the mind of any one, who has carefully read the preceding pages, of their truth. Assuming that this is the case, to save repetition, I shall not further allude

to them in my defense; but proceed to notice other charges found in different parts of Mr. B's work, which the Rev. Gentleman has seen fit to bring against me, and which, I have not as yet dwelt upon.

I am charged by Mr. Bolles with refusing to discuss subjects which I had suggested and of referring him to Dr. Bangs. I claim not to have suggested any subject, other than such as related to facts, with which I knew he was familiar, as justifying the public expose of the tracts he had circulated. He has suggested the subjects himself; first, by assailing our institutions in the manner already named, and second, by the letters which he addressed to me. I have not certainly, refused to discuss any question with him, either of a personal character, or, such as were noticed in our *private* correspondence. Nor have I declined to discuss the claims of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy *publicly*, provided he would first pledge himself to observe just and equal rules. As regards Dr. Bangs, Mr. Bolles was the first to bring his name into the controversy, as may be seen in his second letter. Because I considered this irrelevant, and stated, that if he wished to join issue with the Doctor, I presumed he would find him, ready and willing to controvert with him, surely cannot be claimed as a design, on my part, to decline discussing any subject. I was simply referring Mr. B. to the same source for explanations, and discussions if he wished it, relative to Dr. B's work, from which that work emanated. This was merely sending him to the fountain head, for which he ought rather to be gratified than otherwise.

Another charge is, that by leaving the points at issue unsettled, I have impugned the integrity of my antagonist. Now it must be remembered that the issue was made by Mr. Bolles, and some points involved in that issue were of a personal character; as any one can see, by reading Mr. B's first letter. In replying to personal matter therefore, it became necessary for me to refer to facts in which he personally was concerned; and if those facts involved his integrity, then on him who made the necessity must be the blame, if blame there be in calling them forth. It, certainly, is as painful to me as it can be to him, to dwell on personal matters, and this is the reason why I did not even in my private letters allude to various things which I gladly would have refrained from mentioning; but, which I am now under the necessity of noticing publicly. It is remarkable that if discussion was so painful to him, he should have commenced it. Whether he had forgotten certain facts, or thought I was too diffident to name them must be left to the readers own conclusion.

I am charged with denying the *ius divinum* of our most solemn prayers. The prayers referred to are those contained in our ordination service. If Mr. B. means by *ius divinum*, that our

prayers are of divine authority, I would say, that whatever inspiration he may attach to the Prayer Book of his Church, as Protestants, we claim inspiration for no book but that book of books, the Bible. As Methodists, we attach no divinity to the prayers of our ordination service, and claim only that there is nothing in them that is at variance with the spirit, precepts, or doctrines of the Scriptures. If he means, we deny the truth, the sentiment of our prayers, because we do not attach to the term "Bishop," all that high Churchmen have appended to it,—he has first to show, that our prayers contain not by implication—not by his interpretation, but by express declaration all the attributes which they affix, and which we denying to a Bishop before he involves us in the crime of approaching God with the language of hypocrisy! But, has he shown that there is any such declaration? Certainly not, for there is none. The charge is founded upon his construction of our language, and if he claims the privilege of interpreting our language, certainly, we have a right to define the sense in which we use terms, and when he shall prove, that we have no right to use terms in the sense in which we do use them, or that we do not, in fact, use them in a *correct sense*, then indeed he may think he can convict us either of ignorance or hypocrisy. When he has clearly shown, that we have no right to offer up prayers for our Bishop and to implore, that God will give him grace to discharge faithfully and profitably all those duties which the economy of our Church, and the word of God have made incumbent upon him, merely because we do not make the distinction between him and a Presbyter as broad as the high Church party do, then, will he have some ground to urge the charge of dissimulation and hypocrisy upon us. But, until this is done, I must look upon this charge as a violation of the ninth commandment. As slanderous not only to us but to a large and respectable portion of both the Clergy and Laity of his own Church, who are known to have similar views of "sacred orders" to those entertained by us. One could, with as much, if not with more justice claim that the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church—the Popes of Rome—the Archbishops of England, will bring against the Protestant Episcopal Church the charge of denying the "jus divinum" of their most solemn prayers, because they do not attach to their Bishops all the powers and rights claimed by these high Church ecclesiastics; particularly, after having consecrated them by the same formularies.

He asserts that I avail myself of the productions of others without giving due credit. He alludes to this, he says, "with reluctance," but thinks he must do it, as "it illustrates my idea of justice and propriety." Without questioning his sincerity, I would also say that I reluctantly allude to this charge, because it so fully illustrates either his want of a due sense of justice and

propriety, or such an anxious desire to injure the influence of his opponent and to set aside arguments which, he was unable or unwilling to meet, to show that he had forgotten all rules of justice and propriety. But, as truth demands that facts should be given, and as no man would lie under the *unjust* imputation of having purloined from another's works, and of having palmed off, what was copied from them, as his own, it becomes necessary for me to notice this charge of literary theft, and to vindicate myself if possible. The charge is found in various parts of his work; generally, in insinuations, but sometimes openly and boldly avowed: and in one instance directly so. In general it is found in such expressions as the following—"And Mr. Steele in the wake of Dr. Bangs"—"words of abuse which others manufactured for you," &c. These are repeated in various forms and after I had denied to him the allegation. He seems to labor hard to make the impression, that my Lectures in reply to the tracts, consisted of matter taken without credit from Dr. Bangs' "Original Church of Christ." Hence, becoming a little more direct, he says, that in reviewing the above named work he shall examine the positions of the Doctor; and "those who heard your" (that is my) "Lectures can judge whether his arguments are in any respect the same as those employed by you." He says, it is true, in many places, that in personalities I stand alone, and claims for himself, that he has not injured, nor would he on any account injure my influence; but, what could his object here be? He did not hear my Lectures! How then did he know, that I had used Dr. Bangs' arguments? Does he suppose his notice of them would alter the case? Could not the people who heard my Lectures, judge after reading Mr. Bolles' work whether plagiarism had been committed without any such imputation from him? Suppose, that I had used arguments that can be found in the work alluded to, did not the Rector of St. James use arguments that can be found in books not written by himself? Let me tell him, that there is not an idea in his work, on the direct argument, but that I have seen years before I saw him; and most of the arguments I have heard used by one of his Prelates. This however I should not have thought of mentioning, nor do I now notice it, as any disparagement to his work. The fact is, two minds investigating the same subject may fall into nearly the same trains of thought, especially if in their polemical reading they have both perused the same authors, and, indeed, when writing, we frequently do not know where, or how, we obtained our ideas; whether by reading, conversation, or meditation. Every writer or debater well knows that he has used arguments which at the time he did not recollect to have received from others and long after has found the substance of them in standard works. Perhaps if Mr. B. had heard Professor Lyell's lectures

and had been familiar with works on Geology he would have published him to the world as a literary thief. Why a good brother Minister once said to me, *privately*, after preaching, "my dear sir you made rather too free use of a certain author this morning." Why? said I, in reply, I never saw or read the work to which you refer. "Well, said he, I am glad that I asked the question, for though it has been some time since I read it, yet, I, certainly, thought you was on the authors track." Ministers, in these days of loose language, should be careful how they countenance such a course of injustice; for there has been so much published in Sermons, Systems of Divinity, and Commentaries, that *they*, more than any class of public men, are exposed to this charge. But Mr. Bolles' method of annihilating an opponent is not new to him. He has had an example from "high places" in his own Church. When Bishop Onderdonk found himself at odds with Mr. Barnes upon the subject of Scriptural Episcopacy, he found it convenient to avail himself of the same weapon, and parry his neighbor's blow, by telling the public, that Mr. Barnes' sword was a borrowed one. But, the Bishops antagonist was not to be foiled in this way, and he replied, by telling him, that when he wrote his article he had no book but the bible before him, and, that if two minds, independent of each other, in examining the same book, had brought out and proved the same kind of Episcopacy, it would only show, as a strong circumstance, that his views were true. As it is common for pupils, to be more ultra than their teachers, so in this case Mr. B. is found far in advance of his Prelate; for he publicly charges me with using the arguments of Dr. Bangs, without the evidence of seeing or hearing—having neither heard the Lectures nor seen the manuscript. Let me say to this veritable Rector, that I was not indebted to Dr. Bangs for a single argument which I used, nor do I know that I presented a single idea that can be found in his work, with two exceptions. The first of which is this. I referred to some of the authorities, which he used, but they were not taken from his work; for I wish the Rev. Gentleman to know in opposition to what he insinuates, that Methodist Ministers have more than one book in their library, though they have that all essential one of ultimate authority—THE BIBLE. The second exception is, the act—the Royal act—by which a Rector received from a *Layman* the right to preach the Gospel in all the world except the British Empire. This act I read to my congregation from Dr. Bangs' book, which I held at the time in my hand, and which would hardly be a literary theft as every person present saw I did not present it as my own work. I was then treating upon another branch of the subject than that canvassed by the Doctor. My attention was then being given to the fact that we had been assailed by the circulation of pamphlets, in which our ordination

and ordinances were ridiculed, and we were held up as impostors. In the four Sermons that I preached I was occupied in examining the argument of the tracts. I say then, that the insinuation thus made by Mr. B. is false and libelous, and appeal to the manuscript for proof, which will be given to the public as soon as I can secure time to prepare it for the press. I leave it for Mr. B. to settle the justice and propriety of his act in thus assailing the character of a Minister, without the least proof.

The charge of plagiarism in another place is made direct. Mr. B. affirms, that in proposing certain inquiries to him, I had copied them from a work recently published by a Mr. Powell, without giving any marks of quotation. On this I would observe, first, the simple fact, that the inquiries had been used before would not render them inappropriate at this time on the same subject; second, the quotation marks being added would not have made the inquiries more suitable; third, the quotation marks of such of the questions as were given in nearly the language of Mr. Powell, were made in my copy of the letter, and if not in the one sent to him it was by mistake; which of course would not be strange, when it is understood, that the letter was a *private* one, written without the least expectation that any but himself would see it, and when it was sent to the press by him, I was not permitted to revise it for publication, nor even see it until presented to me in the book form, nor can I even now have access to it in the manuscript: fourth, the questions of Mr. Powell were used by him not as Mr. B. says, to present the points of difference between Oxford divinity and Wesleyanism, but as constituting the different steps in the doctrine of Apostolical succession as defined by the high Church party; and as Mr. B. identifies himself with that party, the suitableness of the application must be apparent.

In the postscript to his third letter I am also charged with historical ignorance,—first in supposing that tract No. 5 was one of the Oxford tracts. This would not be strange for as there is not the name either of author, printer, or publisher to it, and knowing, that the Oxford men were engaged in publishing tracts of this character, assailing all other Churches except Rome, and consigning them over to the uncovenanted mercies of God—it would be very natural for one to suppose, that they were the authors of this. But strange as it may appear, I made no such assertion. In that letter not a particle of evidence can be found to sustain the insinuation. It is an entire fabrication made up by the Rector of St. James, for what purpose he must show. However, we are now informed by him that, some *country Clergyman* finding himself annoyed by these Methodists—and indeed they are quite pestilent fellows, as the Apostles were—and very probable in his neighborhood, some of his old communicants had

got converted, and very likely had ventured to say, that they believed the Methodists were in just as good a succession as his honor—this country Clergyman went to tract writing, but fearing the storm that these fellows would raise against him—a storm of truth, of course—for a Minister in the direct line of the seven hills should not fear the storm of error—the storm, that would result from an exposure of his misrepresentations, withheld his name. We are told, however, that *the Church* has had nothing to do with it. Oh! no, *she* “is founded on a rock and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.” Still as it is very convenient sometimes to defend her against the floods of earth, and to maintain a show of consistency, she has a wonderful supply of enterprising Ministers who volunteer, in their individual capacity, to engage in the contest—not over their proper signatures—as this would be to hazard a little too much, especially as *the Church* does not, in reality, need any defense, and more, if in the heat of controversy any thing should be said not exactly orthodox, it will be a very convenient way to clear the Church from all responsibility of such sentiments: and what is best of all, should they get worsted in the argument, the world will never know who it was; and thereby all the disgrace of a defeat will be avoided. Thus disciplined in the tactics of Jesuitism, each assailant taking a fictitious cognomen, concealing all but the instrument of death, commences the work of destruction upon all the Churches around; but to their utter dismay, the Rector of St. James has so identified himself and his Church with these productions, that the world will hold her responsible for them, let them be heterodox or orthodox.

I am charged with historical ignorance in also supposing, that Bishop Taylor was yet alive and one of the Oxford tract-men. There is nothing in my communication, written in haste as it was, as a *private* document, that warrants such a construction. The sentence, from which the idea appears to have been taken, is, indeed, elliptical, but most men would have thus supplied it as was originally intended “the doctrine of Bishop Taylor,” (the doctrine) “of the Oxford tract-men,” and yet Mr. B. tells his readers that he is not captious, catching at a word, but one of the most magnanimous, honorable disputants in the world! It is well he told us of it, for certainly we should have been greatly in the dark if he had not. I owe him an ocean of gratitude for his indulgence, for he declares, that, I am quite vulnerable, and had he been disposed to lay violent hands upon me, woe betide me! In order that we might have proof of his skill and power, he presents one specimen, in which after making a false issue, assuming without proof his main position, and drawing an absurd conclusion, he imagines no one will doubt, hereafter, the infinite obligations I am under to him for the mercy he has shown me.

I have only to say, that if to get the name of an honorable disputant, and to secure the sympathies of community, it becomes necessary for me to take such a course I shall probably live and die without the honor of the one or the consolation of the other: But I have to learn the falsity of the old maxim, "Honesty is the best policy." Nor did I suppose that Bishop Taylor, D. D. born in 1613, at Cambridge, educated at Caius College, Chaplain to Archbishop Laud, Charles I, and Lord Carberry, Bishop of Down and Connor, Vice Chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin, author of *Liberty of Prophesying*; *Life of Christ*; *The Great Exemplar*; *Holy Living*; *Holy Dying*; *Ductor Dubitantium*; Sermons on various subjects, &c. and who died in 1677, was still living, as Mr. B. says I SEEMED to have so supposed. Where? Is there any ground for any such *seemed* supposition in my letter? Had he said *dreamed* supposition, I should not have thought so strange. And it seems to me to look like a very great anxiety to make a thrust somewhere—it seems to me, also, that such a multitude of mistakes in one attempt to illustrate my sense of justice and propriety, should be a lesson of caution.

I leave it for Mr. B. to settle the respect he has shown this venerable Prelate in calling him "OLD JEREMY TAYLOR." Is this the way they generally speak of their Prelates? "His Grace and Most Reverend Father in God by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Canterbury Metropolitan and Primate of England; the Bishops, Lords, Lords Spiritual," &c. How does this compare with "OLD Jeremy Taylor"? Would he think it very graceful or reverential for me to say, even in a *private* letter, OLD Samuel Seabury, OLD William White, OLD Samuel Provoost, &c.? He further states in this postscript, that the quotation I had made was verbatim, except the word "rites" for "rights." As the spelling matter will come up in another place I will only say here, that this attempt at criticism in orthography is in perfect keeping with the whole case. And it may seem strange to the reader, not being acquainted with this Rev. Gentleman, that in *one seventh* part of *one letter* from such a master of science there are TWENTY TWO words misspelled, many of them occurring in quotations from authors where their orthography is correct. And yet, this is a fact, of which if any doubt they can, by calling upon me, see for themselves the manuscript in his own hand writing!!! Surely "this should be a lesson of caution"! A caution for those who say so much about the sin and evils of schism to study at least the *orthography* of SEPARATION!! Now, if Mr. B. cannot illustrate my sense of justice and propriety without such a gross violation of both justice and propriety, I should think he ought to proceed with his work, as he says, "with great reluctance."

Again I am charged with manifesting a wrong spirit. As to

the spirit manifested in the work Mr. Bolles has published, it is probable, that a person who is ignorant of the circumstances and who looks at words more than at ideas in the abstract, will be disposed to award to Mr. B. the milder spirit of the two; indeed this has been the only praise I have heard bestowed, as though the great point in dispute was who can write in the smoothest style. Such criticisms may be well upon literary compositions but in polemics, truth and facts should be the object—the manner of presenting, them the last thing thought of. In reference to the letters Mr. B. has published, before judging of the spirit of the performance the reader should take into account, first the fact, that my letters were *private*, while Mr. B's were written with the express design of publication. Who is not aware, that in writing for the press there is always greater care in the selection of words? And who does not know, that even the charge of falsehood may be so worded, that an indifferent reader would not suspect any such charge was intended? But in a private correspondence there would be no circumvolution, especially if one supposed that he was writing to an honorable man—which of course I supposed until I had evidence to the contrary. And this evidence was not before me until I wrote my last letter which for some cause Mr. B. has seen fit to keep from the public. Second the fact, that Mr. Bolles was the assailant and chose his own ground. The letter which he wrote, was, it is true couched in chosen language; but it contained a complaint of wrong, merely because we had sought to defend ourselves, and a professed expectation that he should meet me in heaven,—after publishing me in these pamphlets as the associate of Korah, Dathan and Abiram—who, for their sins were ingulfed in the earth, as unfit to live upon it—such complaint, and such professions, after such a course of conduct, were impertinent at least, and called for proper rebuke. Third, that the question is not about the *language*, but what the sentiment conveyed? Now if we are to be governed by the sentiment, strip Mr. Bolles' letters of their useless verbiage, and the case would be vastly different. In my second letter, I point out some of the charges of slander and falsehood which he has brought against absent brethren. And I admit, indeed, that I did not soften my words to save appearances. I spoke plainly and honestly what I conceived to be true. The question is whether my statements are true, as he says about exclusiveness, that it is not whether a doctrine is exclusive or not, but whether it is true. Were my statements true? A man may try to create a sympathy by saying that his opponent uses hard sayings, and some, who have no discrimination, may have their sympathies excited, but all such attempts with those of candid minds who can penetrate the gauze covering, it will only have the opposite effect. No one who has read Mr. B's book candid-

ly, but has perceived, that his great effort was to make a false issue—to draw off the mind of the reader from the *facts* in the case, to the *spirit* of the execution. Still plainer may it be seen in the newspaper notices which his friends have taken of his work—the *spirit* of the performance. I wish to say, distinctly, that I have no desire for such efforts. While I would deprecate bitter invective—and this let it be remembered is none the less so because clothed in smooth language—I still would speak *definitely*. When all the circumstances are taken into the account before a verdict is rendered, I shall cheerfully abide such verdict, both as it refers to *spirit* and to *matter*.

On page 67, Mr. B. charges me of having virtually admitted, that so far from his having commenced an attack upon the regulations of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the circulation of pamphlets, I was the originator of the whole difficulty, by introducing into this community books and tracts, hostile to the Protestant Episcopal Church, before even the tract complained of was published. This is a very strange declaration. No such admission can be found in any thing that I have written: but, on the contrary, an express denial and that more than once. No such admission could in truth have been made, for I have introduced no such books into this community—unless the removal of my private library from Lockport to “my own hired house” in Batavia, is such an introduction.—The only book of this character that passed from my house has been noticed and the circumstances connected therewith already been given. Neither could it in truth have been admitted that such books or book were thus by me here introduced before the pamphlet complained of was published. The edition of the pamphlet which I have was published in 1841. The edition circulated by Mr. Bolles was an earlier one as is evident first from the corrections found in the one I possess, and second from the testimony of their salesman at their tract depository in New York. This proves not only that his edition must have been published very early in 1841, but also gives some idea of the effort that must have been made to give it such rapid circulation. The book was taken from my house the first part of January 1842. Months before this, tract No. 4 had been circulated by Mr. B. to various persons, in this community, who are willing to testify to the fact, if necessary.

With such unwarranted assertions Mr. Bolles exultingly says, he has established the position of my having commenced this trouble by *facts* and *dates*, about which nothing that I can say, will blind the reader’s eyes. Indeed, I do not wish to blind their eyes, and trust the community will not be blinded to *facts* and *dates* by his flourishes. But what facts has he given that I have not shown to have not the least semblance of fact, other than that they are false. And as to dates, to ascertain and fix them,

was the reason of my direct questions, but which he saw fit to evade. *Facts and dates?* these are what I wanted, and had he answered directly, facts and dates would have been brought out. We know we have facts and dates to prove all that has been asserted, and, as little as he may think of the "Leaders," he will learn that they did not draw up the document containing their request for me to defend our Church against the attacks of the Rector, without facts and dates. He says, indeed, that he gave the tracts only to persons who called for them. Now I will say, that I have facts and dates to show that he not only put them into the hands of a number whom he feared were becoming tinctured with Methodism, and into the hands of a neighboring clergyman of another denomination, unsolicited, but that he, or some friend for him, left them at the Bookstore for sale, from which I procured one myself, and that too, before there was any provocation on our part. On all these matters we have *facts and dates*—witnesses from his own as well as other Churches—to which we may add the testimony of the merchant who sold them. "These are facts about which there can be no mistake, and in relation to which, no individual can blind *our* eyes." All this was known to the Reverend gentleman when he declared, "that we had originated the difficulty by leaving the tracts at the Book store ourselves"!! and after he had been corrected in this error, again and again, he still repeats it, as on page 66 he says, "your Leaders placed tract No. 4, on Methodism, in the Book store." In this issue, then, we have against him, the testimony of the Leaders with that of the merchant, a communicant in his Church, and nothing but his *ipse dixit* to balance! Is the man mad? Who will the community believe on this point? This he makes the hinge of the whole matter; virtually admitting, that if he circulated the tracts, we were justified in all our proceedings. As to his facts and dates, then, about which he says, "there can be no mistake," it will be in time to decide, when he shall have presented them.

I am charged with having injured and slandered bishop De Lancy, by publicly stating, that he had had an agency in the introduction of tract No. 4, into western New-York. In various places Mr. B. charges it upon the Leaders, but as on page 66 he brings it directly against me, I feel myself called upon to reply. My answer then is, first, I have never so stated. I read a communication from the "Leader's Meeting," containing such a statement; but this is a different matter. To make the charge good against me, it must be proved that I was the originator of it. Second, if I had made such a statement, I do not think it would have been unjustly injurious or in any sense slanderous: for first, if tract No. 4 is what Mr. Bolles affirms it to be, there could no injury accrue to the bishop by a knowledge of his agency.

in giving it circulation; its being injurious to him must rest upon the admitted fact that it is of such a character that no bishop can with safety to his standing and influence, give it such a sanction. Believing the tract to be of this character, if the bishop's influence was injured by a knowledge of his sanction, then it was a *just* injury for which he alone is responsible. Second, I do not believe it to be *slenderous* for I consider the statement *true* and this belief is founded, first, on the testimony of no less respectable a firm in the city of New-York, than that of "Sword and Stamford," who did say that bishop De Lancey had obtained from their Store a quantity for the use of his Diocese. Second, a few weeks after this they were in circulation in different places in his Diocese. Third, It has been asserted by members of that communion, that the bishop was the agent by which an order for this publication from Western New-York was filled. Fourth, The direct question has never been directly answered. Mr. Bolles indeed, says *now*, that the bishop said he had never seen or read it. This is more than one of his members, to whom he refers, stated *soon after* the Bishop was here. That member said, the bishop had informed him, he had never *read* the tract, but *now* it is, he had never *seen* or read it—but even this does not meet the case. He may not have seen or read it, and yet have done all with which he is charged. Why was it not just as easy to say he had never had any agency in the introduction of these tracts into Western New-York? From these and other reasons I believe the allegation true, and hence Mr. B's great cry about having slandered a Bishop, returns upon his own head—he having slandered the people of St. John's Church for telling the truth about his prelate.

I am charged with declining to communicate to Mr. Bolles, upon his request, the Lectures I had delivered against the Church, thereby depriving myself of the advantage of fortifying them against any objections that he might urge; foregoing the opportunity of giving them a permanent and lasting form and thus making it necessary for him, either to let them remain unanswered with all their poison corroding the vitals of those who heard them, or else attempt to neutralize their poison by replying to Dr. Bangs' "Original Church of Christ"! This is, indeed, rather amusing. Upon the request of the officers of our Church, and after the noise had been one week before the public, I preached a few Sermons in defense of our Church, repelling the blow aimed at it by Mr. Bolles. Mr. B., without venturing to come and hear for himself, addresses me after a few weeks, requesting me to write out these Sermons and forward them to him for his special benefit, and, in return, he will make such criticisms upon them as he is disposed, and if he deems any of the positions unsound, he shall expect that I, as an honest man, will upon his sugges-

tion, publicly retract such opinions. Because I declined his offer, he would have the reader understand that I was ashamed or afraid to have him see them; and, hence, declined the great favor he would have conferred upon me; for the reason that I had borrowed my arguments from Dr. Bangs! Here is logic, magnanimity and justice of a very high order! The thief who stole the sheep skin and then abused him from whom he stole it because he did not give him the sheep used quite as good logic! Had I been ashamed of my Lectures it is a wonder how I came to deliver them! Had I been afraid of being detected in the theft, it is equally remarkable how I had courage enough to preach them, after a public notice had been given one week, not knowing who would make up my audience; indeed, not knowing, but that the Rector himself would be present! Is it not surprising that I should be so reckless, as to preach them, and then in so short a time become so exceedingly prudent and cautious? Having delivered them, it would be fair to suppose that even had they been stolen, I would be so thoughtless as to permit him to read them! And, if, I was so cautious in the latter case, is it not reasonable to suppose, that I would be sufficiently so in the former not to be justly charged with literary theft? And hence, is it not reasonable to conclude, that Mr. B. has not hit the real difficulty in the case. Now as I claim to know the real cause in this matter, I observe that I declined his proposition, first, because I was not able to comply with his request. I had no such lectures as those for which he called. He desired me to furnish the substance of my Lectures *against the Church!* Now I had no knowledge of having, or ever having had, lectures of this description, either with or without substance; and hence, it was utterly impossible for me to comply with his request. Surely the good man ought not thus to impugn my motives for not sending what I did not possess. I had, indeed, preached four sermons in reply to an attack made through certain tracts, by Mr. Bolles, upon the Churches of Batavia, in general, and upon our Church in particular. If tracts Nos. 4 and 5 constitute *the Church*, then, indeed, the thing for which he called had an existence; for I admit the Sermons were against the tracts. But as it is not probable, that he will admit this, I was, therefore, unable to comply with his request; for the reason I had not that for which he called. Second, admitting that I had that which he requested, the work he asked me to perform was unnecessary; for he could have heard them if he had been disposed, or we could have examined the manuscript at my house had he wished to do so; and, thereby, secured any fact which they contained. It was unnecessary, then, for his private use. It was unnecessary for the good of the people for they had the pamphlets, and they having heard the Sermons, could judge whether their doctrines were

fairly stated, and fully exploded. Here is also seen the unreasonableness of Mr. Bolles' complaint, that I read to the congregation out of the pamphlets, and argued about them, as though they were the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Now had I have done this what would there have been wrong in it? Has the Rector been circulating tracts that contain doctrines, hostile to his Church? If so his good Bishop should see to him. The great mistake of Mr. B. is that he seems to have fixed in his mind, or rather wishes to fix in the public mind, "that the Sermons were professedly aimed at the Church." They were announced as an effort to defend ourselves against the positions and inferences of the tracts; hence, it was proper to read these pamphlets and to argue about them, &c. The work he requested was unnecessary for my own good, as I did not suppose he would add much light, and in this, his book shows I was correct: and it was possible for me to give them a more permanent form without the supervision of Mr. B. in conducting them through the press. Third, his alliance to the jesuitism of Oxford was sufficient of itself to impair confidence and subsequent developments have proved that in this I had judged correctly,—that he was not the man to be trusted with such a document. Is a man who secures under certain pretensions, as a *private* matter a few letters, and then publishes them to the world as replies to communications which the author of them has never seen—a man who will take private letters and hand them about the community, making the lowest remarks upon them—is *such* a man to be trusted with any unpublished documents? What reason had I to conclude, either from his acts or from the treatment Mr. Wesleys writings and Dr. Coke's private letters have received from high Churchmen, but that, if I should have sent the manuscripts to the Rector, the same liberty would have been taken, and such portions as he was disposed to use, published as the entire Lectures—published with such misstatements of circumstances and facts as were calculated to make the most injurious and false impressions? Such an act would not be a greater abuse of confidence than he has been guilty of in the book I am now reviewing. No, if they go to the public, as they probably will, I choose to conduct them through the press, without any of the officious intermeddling of such a violator of all those principles of honor which should govern the actions of social life. Such are some of the reasons why I declined Mr. B's proposition. And, whether it was honorable or just, without any knowledge of the cause, save the reason, which I assigned in my letter—"that he could have heard them for himself had he been disposed"—was it just for him to impugn my motives, and to make the most injurious insinuations? To say that they were borrowed? I envy not such a heart! He may talk about his good will, and his fervent prayers for me on

one page and on the next show the dagger of Joab, and some may be so simple or blind as to believe that he is all loving and kind, most angelic and heavenly in his spirit; but discerning minds will decide that "*actions speak louder than words.*"

Mr. B. charges me with having delivered my Lectures at a very unsuitable season. First, he claims the hour was unsuitable—an hour when there was no service in either of the other houses. Certainly, what we did, we wished to do open and above board, in broad day light. We wished friends and enemies to come and hear, for themselves, and, hence, had our service at an hour when all could be accommodated. But, what did the Rector do? He says, indeed, he went to as many individuals as he could on the Monday following the delivery of my first discourse, and advised them, to be quiet and much in prayer! Without calling in question the instructions he imparted, the fact, that he visited as many as he could on that day, no one who had an eye to St. James' will doubt. And, had we not his word for it, we should be led to conclude from other circumstances, that very different instructions were given. The fact, that he changed the time of his service on that day, from evening to the hour of ours—an hour on which he had not before held it—that a stranger, as was announced, had been engaged to preach for a few succeeding Sabbaths at that hour only. These and other facts, would lead one to suppose, that the instructions might have been of a very different character. Second, he claims "the period was very unsuitable." It was a season "of peculiar interest with his people." I am not aware, that there was any thing of a revival of religion in his Church; except he had service a little more frequent than usual. I had not heard of any convictions of sin or conversions to a *spiritual* Christianity there. It was just at the close of a protracted meeting at the Presbyterian house; but, that this was interest of any value to him, other than an expectation of securing some of the converts, no one will suppose, who is acquainted with his hostility to those efforts. That he was afraid that some he had watched with peculiar interest might change their views in reference to the importance of a high Church succession, it is quite probable; and, hence, on this account, he might think the season very unsuitable. But, certainly, if it is true, that in such a succession there alone can be found the "life giving sacraments," surely, as we value life, it was time for the subject to be agitated, and the people to be guarded against the sin of schism. So thought Mr. B. and hence read to his people Dr. Chapman's Sermons. If the charges brought in the pamphlets calculated to prejudice the public against us, were false, surely, it was the time when a large number stood at the door of the different Churches to disabuse the public. And shall the defender against the attacks of his neighbor consult the con-

venience of the assailant? Did Mr. B. consult our convenience when he circulated those tracts against us? Might not we say, the season was very unsuitable—that we had just erected a new house of worship, and were collecting the friends of Methodism who had been scattered into different congregations? Was it not an unsuitable time to seek to convict us of being impostors, before we were prepared to make a defense, and the Pastor, according to Mr. B., without an established character; and that too while he professed the greatest friendship for us? It is *always* a suitable season to defend ourselves against the assaults of an open or masked enemy.

Mr. B. charges me with unjustly identifying him with the doctrines of the tracts,—in announcing him as the circulator of the pamphlets; and then by proceeding to argue against them, it was holding him responsible for their sentiments. In reply, I would say, that in the announcement made, and course of argument pursued, he is correct; but how does this correspond with his frequent assertion, that the Lectures were against the Church? I had attacked the Church! Did he consider himself the Church? Has he not warranted all this identification in circulating the tracts, and then affirming that the doctrines of tract No. 5 are set forth *as held* by his Church; and that both this and tract No. 4 have been written, published, circulated, by her Ministers. If he thinks at this time the connection is a dishonorable one, let him blame himself and not others for it.

Mr. B. charges me with ingratitude. This claim of gratitude is founded upon the grounds that he drew up a subscription to secure funds for the erection of our house—that his people subscribed—that they spake kindly of me—some of them attended my evening lectures! Therefore, I ought to feel under great obligations. And what, though the Rector has published me an impostor; and written hypocrisy upon all my ministrations; and circulated tracts which affirm that we have no sacraments; but are living in open rebellion against God; surely his acts of kindness should silence my voice and amply repay me for these *little* difficulties. This I understand is a favorite point with him. He seems to imagine, that all the world are under great obligations to him. That however much he may outrage community, none have a right to say why do ye so? This is a claim that I do not admit. If a man has treated me kindly, I will reciprocate that kindness; but I admit not, that this kind treatment has purchased the right for its author to insult me! or that in being the object of it I must be subservient to his caprice whatever evils may be the result. I deny any such great obligation. He had done no more than he should have done—not as much as he voluntarily promised he would do. Our people had been in the habit of attending his Church—had paid for its erection and for his

support four fold more than they have received: and was it remarkable, that he should draw up a subscription, not a general one, as he says, but for his own people, and after being circulated by *us* the amount of \$45 should be subscribed?—that when he had no service a few of his hearers should come to our house of worship? Was this strange? It may seem strange to him, just now inflated as he is with the exclusiveness of high Churchism; but I can assure him it is nothing strange with me. While I cheerfully grant all marks of kindness received here, I must deny their being peculiar from those received in other places. I have warm friends in the Protestant Episcopal Church; and I can assure him, if he wishes to cut off all friendly feelings, his course is the right one, and he will soon build a wall of sectarianism sufficiently high between his Church and ours to prevent the least intercourse between us.

And such also will be the effect of the use high Churchmen are making of the friendly expressions which the Ministers of other Churches are disposed to make of them. If we speak of their errors, we are attacking *the Church*! If we speak of their virtues we are dissatisfied with our Churches and are soon to join theirs! This is the course of Mr. B.—the use he makes of a few sentences I dropt in favor of their Church: and quotes from various men who had similarly expressed themselves; and represents Adam Clarke, L. L. D. F. S. A. M. R. I. A. as having preferred a place in the succession, but on account of his *ignorance* he was under the necessity of remaining without. Bishop Onderdonk and Bishop McCoskry have taken the same course. Will any unprejudiced man suppose that the gentleman from whom Mr. Bolles quotes would have *preferred* the successional ranks and were *dissatisfied*? No, and yet this is the impression he seeks to make. They must account to another tribunal for this perversion of the language of these bright luminaries of the Church who being dead cannot defend themselves. Some of them might have preferred ordination from a Bishop in the establishment because of the influence it might secure, not because they had doubts of the *validity* of their own. To thus construe any language that may be used in a spirit of kindness into that of *eulogy* of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and *dissatisfaction* with our own, is to repress and to prevent all such generous feelings and expressions; and Churches not Protestant Episcopal will see the propriety of being more guarded and less frequent in their notes of approval. The extracts made by Mr. B. warrant no such construction and the other writings of the men from whom he quotes prove this not to be their sentiments. How pitiful do such constructions appear by the side of the noble sentiments expressed by Clarke, Hall, and Doddridge!

CHAP VIII.

Mr. Bolles' Charges continued—reproachful epithets—Popery—the present Oxford excitement, similar in nature, and circumstances, to the one in the days of Mr. Wesley.

Mr. Bolles manifests great sensitiveness about my use of the word "Popery," and thinks, that I have applied "reproachful terms," because I said, that "I was opposed to the exclusive principles of tract No. 5 for the same reason that I was opposed to Popery," and on this account entered "my protest against the semi-Popery of Oxford Tractarians and their coadjutors in Western New York." I did not design to use "reproachful terms," but simply to express what I believed to be the truth, viz., that the position now taken by the Oxford tract-men—the New York Review—the Churchman—Mr. Bolles, and a large portion of the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church was, at least, a partial return from the ground occupied by the Protestant Reformers, towards that held by the Mother Church. In this I felt myself more than sustained by many leading divines of his own communion, who consider the doctrines now advanced by what is called the "high Church party," in England and America, not merely an advance towards Popery, but, Popery itself—Popery in all its essential features and attributes. These divines agree with Dr. Tyng, one of the editors of the Recorder—a low Church paper—in calling Oxfordism "not merely semi, but down right, full grown Popery." This may not be apparent to the reader, and I must, therefore, ask his indulgence—as I would not wish to remain under so heavy a charge without at least an effort to clear myself—while I give some of the evidence on which I based the propriety of using the terms of which Mr. B. complains.

Before I proceed, it may be proper to remark, that in identifying Mr. Bolles with Oxfordism I am not in error, for on p.p. 25 and 26 of his work he speaks of the efforts of the Puseyites in the highest terms of approbation—wishes them "great success," and hopes "that no reproachful names—that no opposition will drive them from their work." He calls it "a movement similar in nature to that of the Wesleys"—(wonder if he thinks it will result in the establishment of a *spurious* Episcopacy, alias Popery?) "and under circumstances strikingly the same." He will not, therefore, consider it reproachful, but rather an honor to be

called a coadjutor of the Oxford-men! Indeed, he has already informed the public, that he has acted as the Agent of their re-publishers in America for this section of country, by obtaining subscribers and transmitting monies; so that the precious truths contained in those tracts might have an extensive circulation.

The reproach, then, is not in charging Mr. B. with Oxfordism or with the dissemination of the doctrines of Puseyism, but, in identifying the "ism" with Romanism in its tendency! Now, as Mr. Bolles has been the agent of these works, in this country—their apologist in this community—has not only circulated these pamphlets, which contain the gist of the Oxford controversy—premises of clerical supremacy, from which, inevitably, follow the whole of their conclusions—conclusions which no plea of *non sequitor* can resist;—he is so identified here with Puseyism, that if I have cast reproaches upon him they were founded upon the identification of Oxfordism with "semi-Popery." Thus I may have reproached him. But, if it can be shown, that the terms are not reproachful—that, in truth, they are warranted, then it may not seem so strange to him, that people abroad should, as he says, charge him with "having fallen into the horrible pit of Romanism"; and *the people* will be able to judge who has been reproached, and who has violated the ninth commandment. It is much easier sometimes to *say* that terms are reproachful, than to *prove* they are so. Proof is among the last things thought of by the advocates of Prelacy.

It may be proper, also, to remark, that I have not directly charged Oxfordism with being "semi-Popery." My protest was "against the semi-Popery of Oxford Tractarians, and their coadjutors in Western New York." If they do not teach semi-Popery I have no protest against them. I was "opposed to the doctrine of tract No 5, for the same reason that I was opposed to Popery; and yet, the doctrine might be a very different thing from Popery. I may be opposed to Alcohol as a beverage because as such I conceive it to be injurious to the human system, and for the same reason I may be opposed to any other evil. It must be obvious, then, that this issue made by Mr. Bolles is a false issue, a gratuitous assumption, not warranted from the language I used, and, therefore, I might excuse myself from any notice of the charge he has brought against me. But, I am willing to meet him on the issue he has made, and affirm, that Oxfordism is at least semi-Popery! This I shall attempt to prove by testimony that cannot be, in candor, questioned. I will not, now, stop to show, that the Oxford party have styled themselves "*Catholics*," and that a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church calls himself "*The Catholic Bishop of Maryland*," nor dwell upon the fact that Dr. Pusey has been suspended from the Ministry for advocating

Mass as celebrated in the Roman Catholic Church, but will present as briefly as possible, some of the features of this NEW *Theology*.

A prominent feature in this theory, known among Churchmen by the appellation of Oxfordism, is a rejection of the name “*Protestant*” as being synonymous with “*Dissenter*.” The Reformers are denounced as heresies, and the reformation spoken of as an evil. “The English Church, as such, is not Protestant, only, politically—that is, externally. It claims to be merely *reformed*, not Protestant.”—(*Tracts for the Times*, No 72, p. 32.) Again, “To hurry men down the steep of ultra Protestantism to its uniform end, the denial of the Lord who bought them,”—(*Ibid*, No. 72, p. 36,) “The very name of Protestantism, cold and negative, and sceptical as it is, ought to be abolished among us.” “That odious Protestantism,”—“I am more and more *indignant* at the Protestant doctrine upon the subject of the EUCHARIST. You seem cramped by Protestantism, etc. etc.—(*Froude's Remains*, vol. 1, pp. 322, 391, 404, 425.) “Of course, union of the whole Church under one visible government is, abstractly, the most perfect state. We were so united, and now are not. These three hundred years, we and Rome have been fighting about the question of precedence in the schism; the while we, at least, have too much lost sight of the melancholly and startling fact, that *we are divided*. An evil, however, surely, at any rate, it is: a most grievous penalty upon sin *somewhere*; upon the corruption which provoked, or the sacrilege which assailed, or both together. We talk of the ‘blessings of emancipation from the papal yoke,’ and use other phrases of a like bold and undutiful tenor. Whether this would be true freedom, the freedom consistant with the most unquestioning obedience, where obedience is due, has come to us with the Reformation, we will not here discuss. Of course, we believe that it has not; and that free though we may still be in theory, we have yet practically lost by the change, even in point of freedom. But a yoke, a spiritual yoke, is of itself no necessary evil. We *trust*, of course, that active and visible union with the See of Rome, is not of the essence of a Church; at the same time, we are deeply conscious that, in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a *great privilege*.”—(*British Critic*, July No. 1841.) “Well, what we say is, that to call the earlier reformers, Martyrs, is to beg the question, which of course, Protestants do not consider a question; but which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can for a moment think of conceding to them, viz., whether that, for which these persons suffered, were ‘*the truth*.’”—(*Ibid*, p. 14.) “There cannot, however, be a doubt, that serious as are the impediments in the way of our speedy return, as a nation, to the ‘old paths,’ these impediments would be multiplied a hundred fold, were the Church

of England to be considered as in any degree pledged to the private opinions, of individual acts, of her so-called reformers. One does not see how, in that case, persons who feel with Mr. Froude's editors, that the lines respectively, of Catholic antiquity and of the English Reformation (except so far as the genius of the latter has been overruled by influences extrinsic to the opinions and wishes of its promoters,) are *not only diverging but opposed.*"—(*Ibid.*, p. 28. "Quite lately a third party has sprung up, of persons who have the boldness to admit the substantial accuracy of the views which we have just now supposed, of the English Reformation and reformers; but who consider, nevertheless, that such a view is perfectly compatible with the strenuous maintenance of characteristically Catholic doctrine, and even with a dutiful attachment to our own branch of the Church. This party may be considered as represented in the preface to the Second Part of Mr. Froude's Remains. One advantage, among others, of such a view, *if it will but hold*, strikes us as being that of its tendency to remove points of disunion, as well as to clear the ground of discussion, with very opposite parties; the Catholics of another communion on the one hand, and the dissenters and advocates of Protestantism on the other. One, among many subjects of contention between members of the Anglican Church, and those exterior to it on both sides, or those who, though within it, incline, in sentiment, to bodies without it, has undoubtedly been that of the opinions of the English reformers. The Anglicans have ever been jealous of the reputation of these divines, and have accordingly resented the accounts given of them, from two opposite sides, with all the keenness of persons attacked in their tenderest point. Now, here is a view, (whether tenable or not,) which would enable us to allow all that Protestants can desire on the one hand, and Roman Catholics on the other, concerning the peculiar character of the reformer's opinions; and he must, indeed, be a lover of controversy for its own sake, who does not turn with pleasure, in the midst of an arduous and unpromising struggle, to the prospect of a refuge at once so pleasant and so secure; so conducive to peace, yet so consistent with dignity, so happy in its present effects, and so promising in its bearing upon the future course of the engagement, as that of *a safe concession*. Here is a view, which has the rare, if not the singular, advantage, of presenting a point of union to those parties, who are united in little, if in any thing else, the Protestant, the Anglican and the Roman Catholic. In vain, from this time forth, shall the 'Record' serve up week after week, choice morsels of Cranmer's Erastianism, or the 'Tablet' twit us (if so be) with Jewell's irreverence. Here is a view which promises us the power of upholding Pope Hidlebrand and the See of St. Peter, for all the reformers denied the supremacy of the Church, and of

ministering in copes, for all they thought even surplices of the essence of anti-christ.”—(*Ibid*, pp. 30—31.) “As to the reformers, I think worse and worse of them.”—(*Ibid*, p. 33.) “I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reformation,” &c. &c.

I have made these extracts, that the reader might have a distinct view of the light in which the great Reformation and these Reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, &c. whom we have been taught from infancy to look upon as Martyrs, for the truth against the usurpation of Papal Rome, are regarded by this party. The very name of Martyr is discarded, and they are held up as having suffered not for truth, but for falsehood and heresy! and as having died as heretics! Bishop Jewell is called a dissenter, and the name Protestant exchanged for Catholic. This party and the Romanists are here declared to constitute one party, arrayed against dissenters and the advocates of Protestantism. Is there nothing here that looks like an advance towards Romanism, like, at least semi-Popery? Why, to me it is so plain, that I can see what the Reformers called “the mother of harlots” without the aid of glasses!

Whoever has read the productions of the advocates of this new Theology, will perceive, in all their writings a marked reverence for Rome; an attempt to hold her up to public confidence; a fawning about the Papal Church as their “dear and beloved sister,” their “holy home,” of which the following quotations are specimens. “Is it then a duty to forget that Rome was our Mother, through whom we were born to Jesus Christ.”—(*Tract No. 77.*)

“O Mother Church of Rome, why has thy heart
Beat so unruly to thy northern child.”—(*Lyra Apostolica*, p. 229.)

A leading principle with Protestants is, that the Bible is the only rule of faith. To this the Romanist adds, “the traditions of the Church,” as of equal authority. All Protestants say, with Chillingworth, “the Biblē is the only sufficient rule of faith and practice.” But, what say these tract men upon this point? “We may say ‘the Bible and nothing but the Bible,’ but this is an unthankful reception of another great gift *equally from God*, such as no Englishman can tolerate; but we take the sounder view, that the Bible is the record of necessary truth, on matters of faith, and the Church Catholic tradition, is the interpreter of it.”—(*Tract No. 71.*) “If it were possible that the Catholic Church could in the highest and exactest sense, meet in a Catholic council we should receive its sentence *as infallible truth*. In proportion then as a general council realizes this idea we hold its decision in reverence.”—(*Brit. Mag. vol. 12.*) Here is taught what the Reformers rejected; and which, if they had not rejected, they could not have justified their action—what all Protes-

tants now look upon with horror, that the traditions of the Romish Church *are of equal authority with the Bible* and both **EQUALLY FROM GOD**, and that the decisions of the Catholic Church council are **INFALLIBLE TRUTH**. In nearly all their works you will meet with such expressions as the following—"The Bible is not the only ground of faith." "The Bible and Catholic tradition together make up a joint rule of faith." "The notion of the Bible being the sole authoritative judge in controversies of faith is a self-destructive principle." When this double rule is in collision; that is, when Catholic tradition is contrary to the plain declaration of the Bible, to know which of the two parts of this is to be regarded as supreme in authority they say, "when the sense of scripture, *as interpreted by reason*, is contrary to the sense given to it by Catholic antiquity, we ought to side with the latter." That is, we ought to side with an *unreasonable* interpretation of the Bible provided it be given by the Romish Church! Here the reader will perceive, that so far from having *semi* we are one step beyond Popery; for tradition is placed *above* the scriptures.

Another leading question between Protestants and Catholics is, the right of private judgment,—whether a person, inquiring what he must do to be saved, is to take the inspired Apostles for his authorized teachers, or the exposition given by a corporation, who claim to have received in regular succession the exact mind of the original writers of the Bible. In other words shall we go to the Bible or to THE Church for an answer to that all important question. Protestants say, to the former; Catholics to the latter. What say these tract men? "We maintain, that the true sense of scripture is handed down from age to age by transmission; and the witnesses to it *profess* no more than to have delivered what they have received; also that private individuals depend more or less upon the word of these *more holy* than themselves, who assure us that they go on continually to find greater accordance between the written and the unwritten word." "We conceive, then, that upon the whole, the notion of gaining religious truth for ourselves by our private inquiry, whether by reading or thinking, whether by studying scripture or other books, has no broad sanction in scripture, is not impressed upon us by its general tone nor enjoined in any of its commands. The great question which it puts before private judgment is, Who is Gods prophet? And where? Who is to be considered the voice of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church?" "Catholic antiquity is the authoritative teacher of Christians."—(*British Critic.*) Here then is most clearly set forth the Romish doctrine, that the interpretation of the scriptures, by the Church, is to be received by the people as scripture. This being the doctrine of Mr. Bolles accounts for his sneer at private interpretation: and "the beautiful specimen" of it he gives in his letter to me. Let it be re-

membered, then, that the doctrine now taught by these Apostolicals, these self-styled Catholics, is, that the soul-stricken sinner, inquiring, "what must I do to be saved?" is not to be answered by scripture, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," but by the Church "Baptism is the condition of salvation, and the Lord's Supper is the life giving bread from heaven."—(Tract No. 5.) "Almighty God has said," so says Mr. Newman, "his Son's merits shall wash away all sin, and that they shall be conveyed to believers through the two sacraments." He also affirms that "the Church has the power of dispensing grace" not only through these two sacraments, but "through those of its own appointment," and that "it is conveyed to individual Christians only by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates." The doctrine here advanced is, that the inquiring sinner must be directed, not to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," not to pray, "God be merciful to me a sinner;"—for Mr. Newman says "it requires the labor of a long life to learn how to pray"—but to go to the Church, and receive the sacraments from these Apostolicals, who through a chain of drunkards, Simonists, and heretics, have obtained the "*donum et Gracia*," the "*claves sive potestas clavium*" and thus thou shalt be saved. Else if thou refuse or a priest of this succession be not at hand thou shalt die and be damned! From all such doctrine, "Good Lord deliver us."

Another doctrine held by Romanists, but rejected by Protestants is "transubstantiation." I need not detain the reader with quotations from the old Reformers to show in what light they held this doctrine, and what importance they attached to it. I will refer directly to these tract men. What say they? "I should like to know why you shrink from saying, that *the power of making the body and blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles.*" "Can any devout man reckon it a matter of small moment, whether the minister with whom he communicates be a *minister by Apostolic succession or no?*" In the judgment of the Church it makes no less difference than this: whether the bread and cup which he partakes of shall be to him *Christ's body and blood or no.*" The sentiment of this quotation shows that the author claims that the communicant must receive the sacrament from a minister in Apostolic succession, and that the bread and cup thus received shall be to him Christ's body and blood. Dr. Hook says, "Jesus Christ's body may be burned in a fire, and his blood poured out upon a consecrated pavement." Mr. Newman, thinks it *literally* true, that "the consecrated bread is Christ's body" so that there is "a real *super locum* presence in the holy sacraments." Dr. Pusey tells us, that "antiquity continually affirms a change in the sacred elements." Is there nothing that savors of Rome here, rather is there not "full grown Popery"?

Another item, is the "invocation of Saints." In tract No. 75 we have a re-appropriation of prayers from the Romish Breviary for the use of Protestants, among which are, the following— "Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that *by the glorious intercession of the blessed Mary, ever Virgin we may enjoy eternal bliss.*" "*Holy Mary and all the Saints, intercede for us unto the Lord.*" "Therefore I beseech thee, blessed Mary, ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all Saints and those my Father to pray the Lord our God for me." Whether this re-appropriation of the Romish Breviary has been introduced into St. James, or whether its Rector, as the faithful agent in carrying out these principles has followed the illustrious example of Mr. Newman in erecting crosses over the holy altar, in kneeling with his back to the people while reading prayers, I have not been informed. If not, it will be well for the people worshipping there to begin to examine the subject; for Dr. Pusey says, "changes of this character should be made slowly so as not to startle the congregation with what is to them an apparent innovation"; and especially as these tractators tell us "we cannot stand where we are, we must go backward or forward, and it will surely be the latter; and as we go on we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation." Dr. Pusey further says, "pray for God's departed servants, since knowing them to be in a state of imperfect bliss until the resurrection. Whenever we pray for the final coming of God's kingdom we do in fact, (if we have any thoughts for the departed) pray at the same time for the perfecting of their bliss." In tract No. 77 we read, "Blessed Lawrence, Martyr of Christ, intercede for us." And most of their writings are spiced with all the mummeries of crucifix, and chrism, holy oil, holy water, crossing, &c. "Let us keep fasts and vigils with the blessed Apostle, Peter, whose deeds of grace working together with our prayers we may obtain what we seek through our Lord Jesus Christ."

"When e'er across this sinful flesh of mine
I draw the holy sign,
All good thoughts stir within me."

I will not detain the reader with other extracts from these works, which might be multiplied to almost any extent upon these and similar points of doctrine; against which the Reformers uttered their protest, inasmuch as the above must satisfy every candid mind that the tracts to say the least are of Popish tendency.

It may not be amiss however, in my justification, to introduce the opinion on this subject entertained by the Low Church party. The following from their paper published in London, called the "Christian Observer," will show whether they think Oxfordism is Romanism or not. "The whole matter, doctrinal and practi-

cal, hangs together. It is essentially this, are we to have the Bible and Protestantism, or the Missal and Popery? We care not to stickle for one cross more or less; to decide how many images of Cherubim and Seraphim we may lawfully have here, or emblematical medallions of the Trinity there, but, we ask to what is the whole matter tending? What are its obvious purposes and results? It is to unspiritualize religion—to make it physical; to convert sacraments into a kind of holy charms instead of a reasonable service; to undo the Protestant Reformation, to substitute a ritual religion for communion with God; to repudiate our sister reformed churches, and to embrace Rome, and above all to obliterate that scriptural and Protestant doctrine by which Luther said, we must stand or fall—justification by faith; and not as Rome teaches, through baptismal influence."

Similar views will be found in "A Synopsis of the whole Tractarian Scheme, written by the Rev. Wm. Goode, M. A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, rector of St. Antholin, London;" in Mr. Isaacs Taylor's late work, entitled "Ancient Christianity," where it is most conclusively shown that Oxfordism is verily another Gospel: or in "Oxford Divinity," by the Right Rev. Charles Pettit McIlvane, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant E. Church in the Diocese of Ohio, an octavo vol. of more than 500 pages. Where this tree "planted in the classic soil of Oxford" and so much admired by the Rector of St. James, and whose fruit is so delicious to him, is called by this prelate "The tree of Romanism," and its fruit "Romish fruit." The good bishop proceeds to show its affinity to Rome in a great variety of particulars of which the following are a part. "The doctrine of Original Sin—sin after Baptism—mortal and venial sins—Purgatory—prayers for the dead—Invocation of Saints—Transubstantiation—Anointing at Baptism and Confirmation—Sacramental character of marriage—use of Romish prayers—Books and Rules of Fasting—Image Worship—Tradition," &c. &c. He charges them with teaching the "*opus operatum* of Rome"—that the mere "outward performance of the ordinances of religion necessarily produces inward religion." Surely this will be authority that will have weight with Protestant Episcopalians here. Their prelate is far in advance of what I have ventured to assert.

It may be proper also to present the opinion of the "Holy Mother Church" herself. The Pope and Cardinals will be likely to know whether the tree of Oxford bears the genuine fruit of papacy! Read, then, the communication from his holiness, for the year of 1839. "The attention of all good Catholics and especially the congregation for the propagation of the Faith, cannot be enough excited by the present state of religion in England, in consequence of the NEW doctrine propagated with so much ability and success by Messrs. Newman, Pusey and Keble, (the

Oxford writers,) with arguments drawn from the holy Fathers, of which they have just undertaken a new translation in English. These gentlemen labor to restore the ancient *Catholic liturgy*, the *breviary* (which many of them recite daily) *fasting*, the *monastic life*, and many other religious practices. Moreover, they teach the *insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith—the necessity of tradition and of ecclesiastical authority—the real presence—prayers for the dead—the use of images—the priests power of absolution—the sacrifices of the mass—devotion to the Virgin*; and many other Catholic doctrines in such sort as to leave but *little difference between their opinion and the true faith, and which becomes less and less every day.* Faithful, redouble your prayers that this happy disposition may be increased.” Here we have the opinion from head quarters, as to the Romanism of these efforts. It is, enough, I think, to show, that their authors have fallen into the awful gulf of Papacy. The testimony of Dr. Fisk, written at Oxford while these tracts were being issued, will be interesting to many. After commenting upon the doctrine of “succession” as now advocated by the Oxford divines, he adds “Indeed, the arrogance of the Church of England in these matters cannot be tolerated. It is subversive of some of those best principles on which Protestants, in general, depend for the spread of the gospel, and promotive of the most arrogant and exclusive claims of the Church of Rome. I cannot conceive how the premises of the *successionists* in the Church can be granted, without leading directly to the Romish Church, as the one most unquestionably entitled to the character of the true Church. I met, in Italy, a clerical gentleman from Natchez, United States, who had given up his charge as a (Protestant) Episcopal minister, and, with his wife and two children, had gone on a pilgrimage to Rome to find the true Church; and on Palm-Sunday he formally renounced his Protestantism, and took upon him the Roman yoke. The reasons he assigned to me for this, for I had many long and faithful dialogues with him on the subject were precisely those which the high Church clergy in England and America assign for claiming to be the exclusive Church of Christ; if the succession of the priesthood and the line of bishops from the Apostles be the only criterion of the true Church, then truly, the Church of Rome has the strongest claims, and all who dissent from her are schismatics and heretics.”—(*Tracts in Europe*, p. 576.)

These Oxford tracts upon which we have commented, have been republished in this country, circulated by the leading clergy of the Protestant E. Church, defended by the New-York Review, the accredited organ of the high Church interest here, and the New-York Churchman, established at the instance of the bishop of the Diocese, in all their most offensive features; and their au-

thors eulogized by the Rector of St. James' Church, Batavia, N. Y. Have I not then shown, from the tracts themselves, from the testimony of Prelates and Laymen in the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, and from Rome herself, that Oxford Tractarians and their coadjutors were the disseminators and advocates of more than semi-popery? The reader will now judge, with what truth Mr. Bolles has published me to the world as having applied to these gentlemen, "undeserved, unworthy and reproachful epithets;" and that too, purely *ad movendam invidiam*, to inflame the minds of the people; to "excite prejudice and arouse the indignation of community against THE Church." Is not the opposite of this statement true, that *he* has brought the charge, purely *ad movendam invidiam* against *me*? Have I said any more, yea as much, as the tracts will warrant; as much as his holiness, the Pope; as much as a large class of his own clergy, his own prelates, his own papers, have said? Verily, if I am justly charged with using reproachful names, I am in honorable company; and with such a man as bishop McIlvane, so far in my advance, I shall but little fear the anathemas that have or may be thundered forth from the Rector of St. James'! In charging me with using "reproachful names," has he not brought his own prelates and clergy under the same condemnation? This, however, is nothing strange or new with the successionists, where excommunication and murder have been the common means resorted to, to jostle the incumbent out of the line, from St. Peter and make room for his rival in prelatical supremacy. Mr. B. must settle this attack upon his own ministers in his own way, as he would not thank a "dissenter" to interfere in adjusting their family broils and schisms. Even a "pretender," while reading the soft words and mild acts of these apostolic successors—these monopolizers of God's mercies, can but smile at their constant prating about the perfect peace, and unity that exists in this "one visible Church of Christ." Surely their leading periodicals have for a few of the past years added some choice specimens of brotherly kindness and love to those that before ornamented the succession road of prelatical domination. And now I leave it with the reader to judge, whether in this issue, made by Mr. B., I am guilty or not, of using "reproachful terms"; and whether the public have not some reason to fear that the Rector "has fallen (or is falling) into the horrible pit of Romanism"?*

* Is it true, what I hear, that the Agent of Mr. Bolles in making sale, in a neighboring city, of the work I am now reviewing, presented it to the Papists of that place as a *Roman Catholic work*, written with a view to put down these schismatics, who are so much in the way of *the Church* in this country? Is it true, that the Romish priest of that city, pronounced the position Mr. B. had taken against the Methodists, and the arguments he employed to sustain

We are now prepared to consider Mr. Bolles' assertion, that this Oxford effort is "very similar in its nature and circumstances" to that of Mr. Wesley. I shall not go extensively into a comparison of these two efforts, put forth at Oxford; as the idea is so ludicrous as scarcely to warrant a serious consideration. Nothing but the fact, that it is here presented by a grave minister to sustain a charge against another, will justify a notice of it. What is the work in which the Oxford divines are now engaged? Some part of it is thus described in Blackwood's Magazine:— "The questions in debate now are, whether men shall turn their heads to the east, or to some other quarter of the compass, during the reading of the creeds? Whether the clergy shall wear little crosses on the tips of their scarfs? Whether they shall put the bread and wine on the table, in the chancel, with their own hands or by the hands of the Church Warden? Whether they shall put them primarily on a little table, apart, or on a recess in the wall? Whether they shall make a bow to them as they advance to the table, or omit that piece of politeness? The Rev. Mr. Townsend it seems, had said cursorily, that all these tricks savored of Popery. Dr. Pusey, for it is no less than the Hebrew professor and canon of Christ's Church who feels aggrieved, proceeds, formally, to vindicate the orthodoxy of these prodigiously childish persons, who think they are thus restoring the purity of the church. Hume, in his history observes with due and keen contempt, that 'the most furious quarrels of the sectaries were about *surplices, rails to the communion table, the position of the reading desk*, and such other trivialities.' And are we to have all this nonsense renewed; and solemn men, in doctors hoods, think that they are not committing the most arrant foolery, by scribbling, either for or against them; and all this frippery; when the very existence of the Church is at hazard? When a rabble of legislators, in the streets, are howling for her plunder. Let Oxford leave pompous trifles of their obscure squabbles and add something manly, honest and rational to the defense of christianity." Says Dr. Fisk, "Mr. Hill and his coadjutors have engaged in writing and publishing tracts of late, some of which fell into my hands—and what, kind reader, do you think is the object of these zealous tract distributors?—not to get unbelieving sinners converted—not to teach the important experimental and practical doctrines of the Gospel, but to impress the common people with the danger and heresy of going to the meetings of the dissenters. Whatever may be the character of the Parish Cler-

it, to be similar to that taken by the Church of Rome at the Reformation, and the arguments she used against the Reformers? Whether the Agent, whom Mr. B. says "has been baptized in *the Church*, and confirmed in *the Church*," exceeded or not, the instructions he had received from his employer, I am not able to say.

gymnan, his is the true ministry; the dissenter is a schismatic, and must not be countenanced. This is the great work of the party at Oxford. This is a *leading feature* in the great reform that is said to be going on among the clergy of the establishment. With this spirit and doctrine, what, after all, can be hoped from such a Church for the conversion of the world?"—(*Travels in Europe.*) The Oxford divines are laboring to show, that the bread and wine are *tran* or *consubstantiated*; so that in burning *that* bread in a fire, or pouring out *that* wine upon a consecrated pavement, the body of Christ is burned and the blood of Christ poured out.—(*Dr. Hook.*) That, the minister should first turn his back to the people in prayer, bowing to the altar; that stoles, scarfs, etc. with crosses upon them, should be introduced, (and, as Dr. Pusey says, gradually lest the people resist it.) That purgatory, merit of good works, prayers for the dead, celibacy of the clergy defended. That, the clergy should return to the cassock as their ordinary dress, which say they, "can be made of silk or of cloth or of any other appropriate material according to the taste of the wearer. Cloth or stuff, cassocks about the length of a top coat, and open *behind*, would be suitable for walking, riding and general morning wear. A longer cassock of silk or of cloth *and not open behind*, would form the full or evening dress. In all cases, the *sash* should be of silk, about two yards long, fastened on the left side by a simple knot, and the ends hanging down." And, this latter subject is noticed by "the Banner of the Cross," (a paper Mr. B. is much interested in circulating) as exciting much interest "among the more sober and pious minded clergy and laity" of the Church of England. Such, then, is the object of these Oxford tractators, in their present effort: and so "strikingly similar in its nature to that of Mr. Wesley"! A reformation of the English Church to the observance of these Roman fooleries, from which, by heretical reformers Cranmer, Ridley, and others, it had wickedly departed! These, doctors, in looking over the national establishment, saw it had become too *protestant* in its faith and practice; had departed too far from Rome, and, hence, felt themselves moved to restore, if possible, the ornaments of this "Papal frippery" lost in the reformation, and thus become worthy of being called the eldest daughter, of what her organizers denominated "the mother of harlots." This is to be effected by scattering broad cast, over the land, tracts in which Rome is held up as having claims upon our gratitude and deference—the reformers and the reformation, the prayer-book, and the thirty-nine articles denounced, as "the production of an uncatholic age." Tradition, succession, sacraments, invocation of saints, sign of the cross, clerical celibacy, Pope's supremacy, etc., held up as the essentials to union with Christ here and hereafter!

What was the object of Mr. Wesley? "In the latter end of the year 1739, eight or ten persons came to Mr. Wesley, in London, who appeared to be deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption, they desired—as did two or three more the next day—that he would spend some time with them in prayer, and advise them how to flee from the wrath to come, which they saw continually hanging over their heads. That he might have more time for this great work, he appointed a day when they might all come together, which, from thence forward, they did every week; namely, on Thursday, in the evening. To these and as many more as desired to join with them, (for their number increased daily) he gave those advices, from time to time, which he judged most needful for them; and they always concluded their meeting with prayer suited to their several necessities." They claimed to be "a company of men *having the form and seeking the power of godliness.*"—(*General Rules.*) Mr. Wesley saw the defect of experimental and practical religion in the clergy and laity of the English Church, and he sought to remove this defect—to restore the blessings of primitive christianity—to spread *scriptural* holiness through that land and through the world; not by a "uniform habit, open or not open behind," not by a restoration of Popish mummeries; but, by arousing the people to seek the power of godliness. This was the object of his studies and labors. He laboured, not to turn men to Romanism; but to God! He referred men, not to the tradition of the fathers; but to the scriptures, as the rule, and all sufficient rule, both of faith and practice. He taught, that men must be regenerated; not by an outward reformation merely, nor the change in the state and relation of a child at its baptism, but the renewal of the heart in righteousness and true holiness, by the power of the Holy Spirit—a renewal preceded by repentance and faith, and the forgiveness of sins, and accompanied by unutterable peace and joy, and followed by a life of purity and uprightness. With love and holy, active zeal, he went forth preaching the gospel in the open air, in private houses, under the shade of a tree, in neglected villages, and hamlets; enduring the pinchings of hunger and want, and the bitter persecution of a wicked, fox-hunting, gambling, swearing, drunken, priesthood! Preaching, not that men should turn their *heads* to the east or any other quarter of the compass, but, that they should turn their *hearts* to God! Not that the clergy should wear little crosses on the tips of their scarfs; but that men should cross the carnal nature, should bear that cross which a denial of all ungodliness and wordly lust imposes. Not that they should make a bow to the bread and wine as they advance to the table; but that they should bow their hearts to God! He preached, not about "surplices and rails to the communion table, the position of the reading desk, or any

such trivialities :" but CHRIST, and HIM CRUCIFIED. He presented, not bodily penance: but Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners. Not baptism: but faith as the condition of justification. He sought, not to lead men back to Rome, nor to the fathers in the Church; but to Christ and God the father of us all. He complained, not that the Church had departed from the *ritual* of worship: but the *spirit* of worship. He complained, not that there was any lack in the form; but that the Church had lost the power of godliness—"the spirit in the letter lost." He laboured, not to introduce "a cassock of cloth or of silk about the length of a top coat, open or not open behind, with a sash of silk, about two yards long, fastened on the left side, by a simple knot, and the ends hanging down." He advocated, not that outward adorning of the flesh, the putting on of gold or costly apparel; but that inward adorning of the heart, that meek and quiet spirit, that love unfeigned, that charity that breathes nothing but good will to its neighbor, that adorning which in the sight of God is of great price. He taught, not that the Apostles or the Virgin Mary, but that JESUS CHRIST was our only advocate with God. Not, that the Bishop or Pope of Rome, but "Christ was head over all things in the Church." Not, that the sacraments, canonically or uncanonically administered, could save; but the blood of Christ received by repentance and faith. He denounced, not the reformers as heretics, and the reformation as heresy; but applauded the zeal, constancy, and piety of these Martyrs, for the truth: represented them as a constellation of the brightest names in the Church since the days of the Apostles, and the reformation as of divine providence to save and purify the Church of the fooleries and blasphemies of Papal Rome.

"Similar in nature and circumstances" says Mr. B. How and in what way similar? Was Wesley called to this great work like the Oxford men? By turning over the ponderous tomes and decyphering the mutilated and interpolated manuscripts of ancient fathers? Was he thus convinced that in his form of worship, he had departed from many of those rites which the early fathers sanctioned? No; but by studying the scriptures; associating with pious Moravians, he became satisfied that though a Church of England-man and a Missionary to American Indians, in the regular succession, whose claim of *paper* title was as clear as the best of them, was unconverted, knew nothing of the power of godliness, was not as yet in the succession of God's ministers, nor an ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by Peter Bohler, his spiritual father, was he led from step to step until at a meeting in Aldergate-street, London, he was constrained to say "I felt my heart strangely warmed."

Waving all controversy about forms and non-essentials, he adapted himself to providential circumstances, and labored to

promote the substance of religion. Disdaining canonical chains that would tie him down to one community, he declared "the world is my parish." "He went forth weeping," bearing the precious truths of a spiritual religion, and returned bearing the sheaves of a spiritual harvest. If inquired of by the lordly prelates, "by what authority doest thou these things?" "Behold," saith he, to these Pharisaical Doctors, "the thousands 'who were dead,' are alive, 'who were blind,' can now see, who were dumb, can now sing, who were diseased, are now healed—clothed and in their right mind. These are our epistles, known and read of all men. The letters of our commendation are these in the Lord." And what did the world say? What did Rome say? Was there any letters of approbation from his holiness, the Pope? Any crosses and scarfs? No, no, there was commotion, it is true, as when the Apostles broke in upon the formalism and bigotry of Jewish and Pagan superstition, and the cry now, as then was, "These men who turn the world up side down are come hither also." It was a revival, a revival, not of tradition; but of New Testament religion—and Wesley was stigmatized, not with the name of a *Papist* but a *Methodist*, a fanatic, an over much righteous man, laying too little stress upon forms; and the doors of the national Church were shut against him. Instead of commendation, it was anathema and condemnation! He was denounced as a disturber of the peace; a schismatic; a violater of Church order. The tree he planted in the classic soil of Oxford was not popish, nor its fruit papacy. It was the tree of *Primitive Christianity*, and its fruit that of the Spirit! The heaviest fire of the enemy's strongest battery moved him not. Called to this work, by the providence of God, he went forth with "a faith victorious; a love omnipotent; a zeal unquenchable; an industry untiring; a disinterestedness unimpeachable." Baptized, not only unto the faith, but unto the death, he stood against the combined powers of earth and hell, and proved himself a true and faithful minister of God. "In much patience; in affliction; in necessities; in distress; in stripes; in imprisonments; in tumults; in labor; in watching; in fasting; by pureness; by knowledge; by long suffering; by kindness; by the Holy Ghost; by love unfeigned; by the word of truth: by the power of God; by the armor of righteousness; on the right hand and on the left; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, yet possessing all things," he labored on, until his proud opposers were ready to cry out, "what shall we do for the world have gone after him." "Similar in nature and circumstances" indeed. Nay, God forbid that the latter effort should ever be similar in its success. Success here, would be as the Upas to vital piety; would bring the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition, and the superstition of the dark ages.

What is Methodism? "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from sin!" What is Oxfordism? "a desire to flee from Protestantism, and be saved from the errors of the Reformation! What is Methodism? a return to primitive Bible holiness! What is Oxfordism? a return to papacy! What is Methodism? a revival of New Testament religion. What is Oxfordism? a revival of the traditions of the Fathers! The universal prevalence of the principles of the former, would be the universal reign of the Spirit of Christ. The universal prevalence of the principles of the latter, would be the universal reign of the spirit of Antichrist. The former was teaching all things whatsoever Christ has commanded; the latter, all things whatsoever the Fathers have sactioned. The former, was a reformation founded on the Scriptures; the latter a reformation founded on tradition. The former a reformation in the Spirit; the latter a reformation in the letter. The former, of inward piety; the latter, of outward popery. The former, of Scriptural simplicity and spirituality as taught in the *purest* age of the Church; the latter, of traditionary jesuitical ambiguity, and formality, as taught in the most *corrupt* age of the Church! "Similar in nature and circumstances," indeed. Why, so far from similarity, Methodism in its nature, spirit, in all its parts, is the perfect antipode of Oxfordism! It is as light to darkness; as soul to the body; spirit to matter; the word of God to the word of man; the grace of Christ to the grace of sacraments; the work of the Spirit to the work of flesh. "Let us obey God rather than man." "For the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple;" but *cursed is he that putteth his trust in man.*

CHAP. IX.

*Mr. Bolles' charges continued. Reproachful epithets—"uncov-
anted mercies"—"exclusive"—"unchurch."*

Mr. Bolles has quite a catalogue of evils arrayed in charges against me for applying to him and his Church various unsavory, "undeserved and unworthy epithets"—epithets "which are not warranted in truth," containing doctrines which they have never embraced, but inferences which others have drawn," and that too "in violation of the ninth commandment." Epithets "which are not the dictates of christian love nor the kindness of brethren in Christ"—epithets which "their enemies have originated," "because of their being alarmed on account of so many becoming tired of the evils of schism and are returning to the bosom of the Church." "A cunning artifice," he says, "to prevent the people from making a serious and solemn examination into the matter." "A kind of attempt to convince the world that the claims of the Church are really too absurd and ridiculous to merit the serious attention of sensible men." That I have "denied them the right to think and act for themselves, of holding their faith in a pure conscience, of enjoying it in kindness and in charity." Upon these accusations he designs to compare me to "Korah and his company," when "they accused Moses of being ambitious, unjust and tyrannical." To the "Pharisees" when "they called our Lord a blasphemer, a sorcerer, a gluttonous man, and a wine bibber." To "those Jews who charged the Apostles that they were pestilent, turbulent, factious and seditious fellows." Verily such grave and semi-sarcastic comparisons should not be made without "substantial reasons." This is not, however, a new method of warfare with high Churchmen. It is no unusual course for them to stigmatize and anathematize all who are not Episcopalian according to their views—no new thing for them to attempt to degrade such, and to denounce them as not of a Christian Church—to pronounce their ministrations invalid—to declare them in imminent danger of destruction—to speak of them as rebels against the Almighty Law-giver and Judge. After having, in their opinion, excommunicated all sister Churches and sent forth to the public their acts of ejectment, then do they endeavor to stamp upon those officiating at their altars the name of hypocrite and impostor.

Because, for sooth, we refuse to admit the claim—resist the attempt to rob us of our christian birth right—and make an effort, by way of self defense, the cry of abuse and misrepresentation is raised. This has been the policy of our opponents; the same as is pursued by the master, (Dr. Pusey,) in England, who has proscribed all other churches, both Romish and Protestant—the policy of “Dr. Hobart when called to an account by Dr. Linn, after he had excluded all non *Episcopalians* from the Church which the Redeemer purifies by his blood and quickens by his Spirit”—the policy of Rome, who not only excommunicates, but consigns the soul to perdition and the body to be burned, of those who dare believe the evidence of their senses and reject the dogma of papacy. High Church claims, in some form or other, have been the sources or fountains from which nearly all the persecution, intolerance and oppression have flowed. We remember the blood of the Puritans and the Martyrs, reformers who resisted the intolerance of Rome. We would not imitate her example. We persecute not. We would not abuse our high Church neighbors by misrepresentations, for there is no need of this. The truth is bad enough. But if self-defense is abuse, they must submit; for we have counted the cost and shall not yield our trust in silence. We shall stand in the gates of our Zion and in humble reliance upon the arm of our God shall seek to resist the unjust encroachments of our neighbors, and if need be, shall carry the battle beyond the gates into the very camp of our enemy. In various ways I intimated, that the doctrines now advocated by the leading periodicals and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, if true, do unchurch and consign over to the uncovenanted mercies of God all who are not *Episcopal* in their sense of the term; and as a specimen, and one on which this whole controversy hinged, referred to the sentiments found in the pamphlets circulated in this community by Mr. Bolles. This, Mr. B. denies, and says, that so far from “*unchurching*” they seek to *Church* as many as they can.” It is true he seeks to make a false issue, and argues upon the ground that I have charged the Protestant E. Church, with having formally, in General Convention assembled, “by special enactment,” “excommunicated and consigned over ‘to pains and penalties,’ all who are not in the pale of her communion.” If he has demolished his man of straw he is welcome to all the honor he can thus acquire; and if he has failed, I claim nothing from his defeat, as this is not the issue which I have made. I shall plead to the truthfulness of the specimen referred to, and present such other similar ones as the case may seem to demand.

I claim, then, that “tract No. 5. of tracts for the People”—being one that Mr. Bolles circulated—does contain evidence of an attempt to unchurch and to consign over to the uncovenanted

mercies of God, all who are not *episcopal* in the author's sense of the term, and that too, without any inference of ours: that tract No. 4, of the same series, circulated here by the same person, is of the same character on this point, only more limited, being confined in its application to the Methodist E. Church. To claim, that a certain kind of faith is essential to salvation, is to declare, that all who are not in the possession of that faith, are not in a state of salvation! To publish that a certain kind of ministry is essential, not merely to the prosperity, but to the existence of a Church, is to publish an act of ejectment against all those bodies of people who, without such a ministry claim to be Churches? To affirm, that a certain kind of Ministry is essential to the giving of the sacraments—that without it, though people may have bread, and wine, and water, and pray over and administer them in the name of the Trinity, nevertheless, they are ~~not~~ the sacraments of the Church, is to proclaim, that all who have not such a ministry, have not the sacraments! To assert that the sacraments are essential to salvation, is to excommunicate and reprobate, all who have not the sacraments! Now, if the tracts affirm, that a certain kind of ministry is essential to the existence of a Church—the giving of the sacraments—they sustain my position; but if they go further and make the application—publish the act of ejectment—who will say that I am guilty of applying “unworthy epithets?” What, then, is the doctrine of tract No. 5? That “the divinely instituted ministry is necessary to the giving of the sacraments—the sacraments are necessary to our covenant with God in Christ, being the official seals of that covenant—and the covenant is necessary to convey and assure to us the pardon and the promise of the Gospel. Without an authorized ministry then there are no sacraments—without the sacraments there is no covenant, no Church—and out of the Church and covenant there is no promise of God's mercy and favor, no pledge, no assurance of salvation.” The sacraments to which the tract man alludes are Baptism, which he affirms to be “the condition of salvation;” and the Lord's supper, “which is the life giving bread from heaven.” This exclusive ministry is one that consists of the three orders, perpetuated by a corporation of bishops, who received originally from Jesus Christ all the power with which he was invested, and were by him constituted heads over the Church; and by them this ministry has been regularly transmitted; and where such a ministry, thus constituted, is not found, he affirms “there is no ministerial authority—there are no sacraments—there is no church: and all men who are unhappily destitute of them, whatever they may believe or profess, and whatever form of religion and religious observances they may adopt, are aliens from that holy covenant into which they have not been authoritatively admitted.”

Herc, then, is not only an exclusive claim set up to all the covenanted mercies of God, but the act of ejectment formally proclaimed. And, that there may be no doubt in regard to the application of this ejectment, the author of the tract informs us that it applies "not only to Presbyterians ordinarily so called, but also to Baptists, Methodists," &c. In this tract, sold by the Tract Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, circulated by her ministers, and in this place by the Rector of St. James—we have an exclusive claim; an act of excommunication; and an application of it to all Churches, not Episcopal in their sense of the term. It matters not however pious, devoted and useful the ministers and membership of their Churches may be; however exemplary in their lives, and orthodox in their creed; however frequently they may have come to the Saviour with penitent hearts and believing minds, and regularly received from their minister baptism and the Lord's supper. Being destitute of a ministry arranged in *three* orders, "they are aliens from that holy covenant, have no pledge, no assurance of salvation." No wonder, then, that his benevolent heart mourns over the state of things here; the evils and constantly increasing evils of schism? No wonder, while he looks abroad and sees these human organizations flourishing at his very door, like trees planted in the vineyard of the Lord; their houses filled with solemn and interested audiences; their altars thronged with inquiring penitents; their numbers daily augmenting; that like Paul on Mars hill his spirit should be stirred within him, while he sees this community, almost wholly given to schism. And that in public places and private houses, by sermons, pamphlets, private letters, etc., he should seek to disaffect and draw away the people from the spurious Churches; to induce them to enter the true fold, and by the imposition of his hands, receive "the pledge and assurance of salvation." Surely if he is the only ambassador of Christ here; if all the other ministers are impostors; if the font at his Church alone, has the water of baptism, and their table alone, the elements of the Lord's Supper; if to his hands alone, is imparted the sacred virus, the mysterious power of uniting them with the Lord Jesus Christ; the keys of Peter, by which the doors of heaven are locked and unlocked; it becomes him to be instant in season and out of season, warning the people against these self-constituted ministers, who have no genuine commission, and hence can transact no business for the King of Kings! Mr. B. must not think it strange if these ambassadors demand not only proof of the spuriousness of their commission, but evidence most clear and satisfactory, of an exclusive right granted to him. He must not think it strange, if the *people*, who have so long listened to the instructions of their pastors; who believe they are as pious, laborious and successful as any of the prelatrical succession-

ists; who can present as many proofs of the divine approbation in their alledged hypocrisy as their high Church neighbors; if they require the most substantial reasons, before they renounce and cast off their present ministers, and embrace all the monsters that throng the ranks of succession, as true ambassadors of the Lord Jesus Christ. He must not think it strange, if while we admire his zeal we remain in *statu quo*, until his exclusive right is established. Until he shows why it is that God blesses these impostors in their rebellion and removes a thousand other difficulties that fill the minds of these schismatics. He must not think it strange, if while our right remains undisturbed and his exclusive claim unestablished, we treat his arrogant assumptions with pity and contempt. That while we cheerfully grant him the privilege of seeking additions to his numbers from the world, we denounce this attempt to tear, rend and slay the members of other folds—this effort to rob us of our birthright, as an officious intermeddling; as an exhibition of that spirit of intolerance and persecution, so early manifested by the disciples and so pointedly rebuked by our Lord. Some may say, perhaps, Mr. B. does not believe the doctrine of tract No. 5? What if he did circulate it; this is not conclusive evidence? That he embraces its position as true, is certain, if he believes what he admits to be truth, for he affirms that the author of the tract “has sustained his positions by arguments that cannot be set aside.” The author declares his position to be against “Preslyterians, Baptists, Methodists,” &c. His design is to show, that the members of these orgaizations have no part in the covenanted mercies of God; and Mr. Bolles says, the author has succeeded in his task “by arguments that cannot be answered;” and further, that the doctrines of the tract are set forth “as held” by the Protestant E. Church. What is more plain, then, that because Mr. B. considered this author as having, by unanswerable arguments, unchurched these sister Churches, he was induced to scatter them in this community? With what kind of consistency with his faith and practice, thus proclaimed, does he charge me with the use of “reproachful epithets?” Because I merely gave utterance to what the tract was designed to prove, and what Mr. B. says it does prove? Who, then, is guilty of bringing a railing accusation against his neighbor? If the reader wants any more evidence, in regard to the doctrines of this tract, let him turn to it, and not to *my* inferences. He will find one of its statements to be, that all who are out of the Church (such a Church as he has defined) “shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” Verily this is unchurching with a vengeance—is “consigning over to pains and penalties,” without any violation upon our part of the ninth commandment!

Here I might rest my justification; for this tract fully sustains

my vindication against the charge of Mr. B. But as this is a favorite retreat of high Churchmen, after having poured forth their instruments of death, I shall adduce other evidence. Let us pass to "tract No. 4, of tracts for the people"—a tract circulated here by Mr. Bolles—the reader bearing in mind, that to consign a people over to the uncovenanted mercies of God, is to prove, that people to be without the pale of the covenant of grace. Tract No. 5 says, that the "life giving sacraments" are the "official seals" of that covenant, and the true ministry essential to the existence of those sacraments. Hence, where there is no such ministry there are no sacraments, no entrance into that covenant. To consign a people over then to the uncovenanted mercies of God, is to show, that they have not the true ministry. This is the hinge according to their doctrine on which the whole turns. Now, what is the object of tract No. 4? Its object, as set forth by its author, is, to prove, that "the Methodists are not a Church—without the sacraments—without a ministry—without a divine warrant"—I put it to all, then, if the design of this author is not to prove the Methodists are without the pale of the covenant? a set of impostors; all their acts invalid; no claim to covenanted mercies; no pledge; no hope of salvation? But, to proceed. The author, after going through his argument, says "the case has been made out, that Methodism is not a Church, that it has no ministry; that it has no sacraments, nor divine warrant," yea more, "that the Methodists are in a state of sin against God." This language fully bears out the assertion, that the doctrine of the tract, if sound, does consign over all, not Episcopal in its author's sense, to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Nor is it possible for this to be evaded, without admitting, in opposition to the main position of the tracts, that it is possible to enter the covenant without a ministry—without the sacraments—without a Church:—this would be to make the whole effort a solemn farce, which I am far from attributing to them. Awarding to the authors and circulators honesty of sentiment, the conclusion is inevitable, that the whole is to exclude from the covenant their Methodist brethren. These are the pamphlets, which according to Mr. B's acknowledgment, were written by one or more of their clergymen—were published by their sanction—kept on sale at the depository of the tract society of their Church—recommended by their papers—circulated by their ministers, and here, by the Rector of St. James. We charge it, then, upon the Protestant Episcopal Church, as only a small part of a concerted plan to hold us and other Churches up to the scorn of the world. I repeat, then, that the publishing of tracts Nos. 4 & 5, is an attempt to eject, and if conclusive in their reasoning, is in fact an ejection from covenanted mercies; and all the mercies we can expect are those given to the heathen, and even these we are de-

nied; for being in wilful rebellion against God—turning away from the light which the Rector has so long and fully shed upon our path, even the heathen shall rise up in the judgment to condemn us, and there is no health in us—no help for us, but by a speedy flight to the sole inheritors of Christ's office and power—the lawful dispensers of indulgencies—the regular descendants of John Tetzel. Even there we shall be in doubt, excommunicated as they have been by the Roman Pontiff. Our flight must be to the seven hills! but even there, we read, *their* whole fraternity have been ejected by the Greek Church, and *that* in turn by the Italian Pope! Thus we are all unchurched and must set down in despair together. But the Methodists have one consolation, viz., that in this murderous work they have had no part. That while these prelatical monopolizers have been making war upon us and quarrelling among themselves about scarfs, crosses and mitres, we have been going out into the highways and hedges, scaling mountains and fording rivers, to preach to those dead in trespasses and sins, Christ and him crucified! And if at last we are rebuked and rejected by our master, we are resolved that it shall not be for having called for fire to consume those who worshiped the same Lord, but in a different form from us. It shall not be for a bigoted attachment to either Jerusalem or Samaria. If we perish, it shall be in the possession of that charity which “thinketh no evil,” and in the exercise of that benevolence which believeth that “God is no respector of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him”:—That “the true worshiper is one that worshippeth in spirit and in truth.”

Lest the specimens adduced should be thought to be rare instances of exclusiveness manifested by our high Church defamers, I will present a few more. The Right Rev. Samuel Allen McCoskry, D. D., in a Sermon entitled “Episcopal Bishops the successors of the Apostles,” has on p. 41, the following language: “the Methodists have not the Apostolic succession.” On p. 43, he says, “this point, then, is clearly settled, that the Apostles held the ONLY ministry which was of Christ, not only the power to rule and govern the Church, but, of course, it must also follow, to *continue* the same power. If not, there never has been any authorized ministry in the Church, and all who profess to be commissioned as ambassadors of Jesus Christ are gross impostors.” Now, without any inference of mine, let us consider what the good bishop of Michigan has said? Why, if there is sense in his argument, he says, that the Apostles held the only ministry which was of Christ, and the power to transmit it. That without the ministry thus transmitted there is nor can be no authorized ministry in the Church, and all who profess to hold a commission as Christ's ministers, who have not received it thus

transmitted, are gross impostors. He affirms, that the Methodists have not thus received their commission, "have not the Apostolic succession," and "the Apostles held the *only* ministry which was of Christ." The Bishop says, then, as plainly as he can, that the Methodist ministers are not "the ministers of Christ" —have "no power to rule and govern the Church," but are "gross impostors." If he does not say this, then language has lost its meaning, and the whole sermon is a fictitious, senseless jargon.

This venerable prelate of the West, has published to the world, in a pamphlet which has already gone through three editions, that all the Methodist ministers "*are gross impostors*;" and, that if the arguments by which he proves we are impostors are not sound, then there has never been an authorized ministry in the Church. Verily, this is a serious matter; an alarming alternative, that the world must either believe that these arguments convict us of being "gross impostors," or else give up revealed religion and turn deists. Now, as that Diocese continues him as their bishop—purchases in such quantities his sermon—it would be a fair deduction, that they consider the arguments of their prelate sound, and the Methodist ministers "gross impostors." This, indeed, is a serious charge. A body of ministers, numbering in these United States more than three thousand travelling, and over six thousand local Preachers, who for piety, for sacrifice, for labor, for usefulness in reforming the world, and a large portion of them for sanctified learning, will compare, perhaps, with our succession brethren, are published by a prelate as "gross impostors." Who is guilty of applying "undeserved and unworthy epithets?" When has a Methodist writer thus published the ministers of the Protestant E. Church? When has one attempted to show that they were not the true ambassadors of Jesus Christ? We have no desire to unchurch them or expose their deformity. We only ask the privilege of being left to enjoy what we grant to them. When they assail us by name and publish us as "gross impostors," as "having no warrant, no sacraments," we feel it a duty to present the seals of our commission, and to prove them genuine; to show that we are a Church, according to the Scriptures, and that if their charge can be sustained, it lies equally against them. We do this, not to reproach them; not to hold them up to the scorn and ridicule of the world; but as a work of justice to ourselves and to the community. To show our excommunicators the importance of laying more stress upon the grace of God, in the ministrations of truth, and less on "baptism, indulgencies, confirmations, and extreme unction, which the price of Simon Magus might purchase." More stress upon the attending and attesting symbols of the Holy Spirit, and less on a formal Christianity. The importance of saying less about THE Church, its ministrations, covenant mercies, its liturgy and shad-

owing rites, and more of justification by faith, a spiritual regeneration and a holy life—of cultivating within their own pale the fruits of the Spirit, instead of constantly assailing their neighbors; of striving to reform the world rather than to disaffect the members of other communions; of imitating the early christians rather than those proselyting Pharisees, who compassed sea and land to make one convert, not to truth, but to their traditions, and when they secured him, “make him two fold more the child of hell than before.”

Another specimen of high Church exclusiveness I shall take, from the writings of the late Bishop Hobart. I quote from him, because Mr. Bolles refers me to him in his first letter, and of course, he will consider Bishop Hobart good authority. His sentiments he will not reject as heretical; and if the “sainted” prelate has advocated the doctrine of the sermon and pamphlets already quoted, I trust, even Protestant Episcopalians will acquit me of the charge “of applying to them undeserved and unworthy epithets,” of “stigmatizing them with names of reproach, for the purpose of exciting a prejudice and arousing the indignation of the community against THE CHURCH.”

Bishop Hobart, in his “Companion for the Altar,” a work wherein we might expect to find the most extended charity, has the following language:—“There remains no way in which spiritual authority can be derived from the divine Head of the Church, but through the agency of a set of men, originally deriving their authority from Jesus Christ, and successively transmitting it to the end of the world.” “Every claim to the ministerial function, in the present day, founded upon an immediate commission from God, must be rejected as false and impious.” “Jesus Christ transferred all spiritual power in the Church to the Apostles.” “The Father sent him, the Prophet, the Priest, and Ruler of the Church. The Apostles, therefore, were commissioned to be the prophets, the priests, and the governors of the Church.” And, after attempting to show, that this power has been transmitted through a line of Bishops as distinct from, and superior to presbyters, he says, “none can possess authority to administer the sacraments, but those who have received a commission from the Bishops of the Church.” And his own inferences are, that the sacraments thus administered “become the means and pledge of divine grace”—that the position which he has sought to defend, “makes the blessings of the gospel to depend upon communion with the Church.” And again, “where the gospel is proclaimed communion with the Church, by the participation of its ordinances, at the hand of the *duly* authorized priesthood, is THE INDISPENSABLE CONDITION OF SALVATION.” And again, which looks some like “consigning over to pains and penalties,” he says, “great is the guilt and imminent the danger

of those, who, possessing the means of arriving at the knowledge of the truth, *negligently* or *wilfully*, continue in a state of separation from the *authorized* ministry of the Church, and participate of ordinances administered by an *irregular* and *invalid* authority, *wilfully rendering* the peace and unity of the Church by separating from the ministrations of its authorized priesthood, and contemning the means which God, in his sovereign pleasure hath prescribed for their salvation. They are guilty of rebellion against their Almighty Lawgiver and Judge. They expose themselves to the awful displeasure of that Almighty Jehovah, who will not permit his institution to be contemned, or his authority violated with impunity." "Deplorable, indeed, in this degenerate day, is the state of the Church, where *sect* ariseth *against* *sect*, and *altar* *against* *altar*, where the Apostolic ministry is invaded and violated, ordinances administered by invalid authority, and that sacred body which should be one with its divine Head, rent by numberless schisms." And if any one should ask, what Church it is that has this Apostolic ministry, where covenanted mercies through unviolated ordinances can be had? he may turn to the Bishop in the prayer he puts into the mouth of the communicant, who, with these meditations and prayers, is preparing himself for the reception of the Holy Sacrament. "Teach me ever to bear in mind, that in thy wise and sovereign Providence, thou hast made THIS Church the channel through which thy *covenanted mercies*"—[a phrase, says Mr. Bolles, lately stereotyped by our enemies for special purposes, yet here used by his prelate]—“are conveyed to a fallen world.”

To say nothing of the absurdity of the monstrous claims here assumed—claims that may be conceded when the people have forgotton history and lost their power to reason. Without attempting to refute the claim, as that is not the object of the quotation, I think it must be evident to every reader, that the doctrine advanced in the sermon and pamphlets, is here taught in all its length and breadth. Communion with the Protestant E. Church, if possible, (and with whom in this section is it not possible,) is claimed as an *indispensible condition to salvation*. Gracious Lord, what has become, then, of our pious friends who never there communed. All who refuse to receive the sacraments from the hands of their ministers, are charged with being guilty of schism; in rebellion against God; exposed to the displeasure of their Almighty Lawgiver and Judge, and destroyers of the sacred body of Christ. These specimens, from tracts circulated by Mr. Bolles—from the writings of two prelates of his Church—must be sufficient, and more than sufficient, to justify the language and warrant the terms I used. They are sufficient to vindicate me from the charge brought in the issue made by Mr. B., for they not only set up exclusive claims, but denounce, con-

sign over to "pains and penalties" all who do not yield to those claims. I might fill this work with extracts of a similar nature, from the writings of those who stand high in ecclesiastical authority; and my great wonder is, that a man who has the credit of being conversant with the writers of his own Church, should hazard, at this day and in this community, the assertions and charges found in the commencement of this chapter. He had wisdom enough not to hazard them in the letter he sent me, for though they are published as parts of letters to which I replied, they are not in the original copy, but are found among the additions which he saw fit to make without my knowledge as he carried them through the press. The Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist Churches are in no way by them regarded as a Church. Notice their phraseology, how guarded upon this point? Turn to any of the reports of their Bishops to their conventions, and what more common than the following language. On such an evening at such a place, "I preached in the Presbyterian, Baptist," or "Methodist *Meeting-house*;" on such an evening, "in *Trinity Church*." "The Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist *denomination*"—"the *Episcopal Church*." "I attended *service* at *the Church*"—"I went to *meeting* at the *Chapel*." This uniform and guarded language, even in common conversation, to the use of which the little urchin is thoroughly disciplined, is most significant and expressive of that ultra and bigoted exclusiveness upon which I have been commenting—an exclusiveness, in which the Rev. Mr. McMechen was unwilling to educate his family, and which induced him not long since to exchange his place in the Protestant Episcopal Church for one in ours!

Mr. B. says that the phrase "uncovenanted mercies of God," is of modern origin, manufactured by the enemies of *the Church*. If he would turn to his high Church writers, he would find the phrase very familiar to them, and not of very recent origin. How was the work of Mr. Daubeny, his "Guide to the Church" understood by the Editor of the British Critic, and by the clergy of the Establishment generally? I have the testimony of a clergyman of that Church, high in influence, who says, that this minister of theirs, (Mr. Daubeny,) "has cut off from salvation, most of the foreign Protestant Churches, and the whole body of Dissenters of every description in this country, but by the uncovenanted mercies of God. This is a most serious and important consideration. It certainly is incumbent upon Dissenters of all denominations to consider well, what this learned gentleman has advanced, and either to refute the force of his arguments, or conform to the established religion of his country. Sir Richard Hill in his apology for Brotherly Love, has given such an answer to Mr. Daubeny's Guide, as that gentleman will not be easily able to refute. If the doctrine of the Guide be right, I do not

see how we can be fairly justified in leaving the Church of Rome. The capital mistake of the whole seems to be, a substitution of the Church of England for the Church of Christ, exactly in the same manner as the Catholics substitute the Church of Rome for the Church of Christ." And yet for doing what this Church of England man advises all Churches thus excommunicated to do, Mr. Bolles would publish us to the world as having *attacked the Church*. Was it not incumbent on us either to refute the arguments brought against us, or go to the true Church? Most certainly, and one of the two I promised my congregation to do, and for the redemption of this promise the Rector is offended? Would he have us dissolve our Church without any investigation? Would he have us quietly and tamely submit to the assumed premises and authority of others?

While I maintain, that the doctrine now taught by the leading divines of the Protestant E. Church, and advocated in nearly all their periodicals, is, without any inference of ours, a publication of our ejection from the covenanted mercies of God, yet I rejoice to say, and feel it a duty to say, that many of the most pious members of that communion discard these exclusive and ridiculous claims, and contend only for their ecclesiastical arrangement and administrations as a more perfect form; not absolutely essential to the being of a Church; thereby leaving others to enjoy equal participation in the blessings of the gospel. With this we should be satisfied. For while we think our form the best adapted to do good to the world at large, we are not only willing, but expect, that others will think so of theirs. When, however, they transcend this, and take positions that can find a parallel only in papal Rome; monopolize to themselves the patronage of God; then we think it is time for us to resist their encroachments and to vindicate our title. We oppose such a monopoly as being an unchristian exclusiveness; an exclusiveness that finds no warrant in the scriptural charter of the christian Church, or in the doctrine or spirit of the christian religion, in the teachings of Christ, or in the authorized acts of the Apostles. These are exclusive doctrines—that denominate as rebels against God the most holy that ever lived—that denounce Luther and his associates as pollutors of the sacred body of Christ—that all the churches which they planted were not christian churches, their members not sharers in, but cut off from, the covenanted mercies of God—that the Reformation, which from infancy we have been taught to look upon as one of the greatest blessings to the Church, and to the world, since the establishment of christianity, was sorely displeasing to God and injurious to man—that the Church of England, having by excommunication, lost the succession, and hence, being under the necessity of uniting her chain to the King, a Layman, as the source of *right* to ordain,

she also, with all her daughters, must be consigned over to a state of rebellion against God; all the Protestant Churches and even Rome herself, must be excluded. And as for the poor Methodists they must, more than all, be denounced as an unlawful, anti-christian rabble, associated upon principles subversive of true christian order, and her ministers sacrilegious reprobates, intruders upon the prerogatives of God's authorized ambassadors! Now, as I cannot bring my mind to disfranchise all the holy men, all these heaven owned and heaven blessed Churches, I cannot admit claims that make such a requisition, but reject all such exclusiveness as opposed to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Bolles says, that so far from "unchurching, they seek to Church as many as they can." Of the truth of the last part of this sentence, their efforts "to Church as many as they can," I presume no one in this day, especially in this community, will doubt. Who can so doubt, after having witnessed their efforts here, and elsewhere, to break in upon the ranks of schism, and draw from other communions materials with which to strengthen their forces. But should any doubt, the assertion of Mr. B. will be satisfactory evidence. To Church however, in their sense, those who think they are now churched, it is necessary, first, to unchurch them; that is, to convince them they are not churched—that though they have been baptized and admitted to Church fellowship, their Church being nothing more than a human organization, and their minister out of the regular succession, so far from being a member of *the* Church, they have all this time been living in open rebellion against God; have even now his wrath resting upon them. To accomplish this, the course is, having selected a suitable subject, (some extreme youth, or those known to be in some degree disaffected,) to place in their hands tracts—tracts written by Mr. Nobody and published by the same gentleman—in which all Churches, save "THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES," are caricatured, the grossest mistakements and misrepresentations of facts made, which to a person unread in Church history, passes for truth—in which these Churches are represented as having their origin in the worst passions of the heart—their ministers compared to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram—their sacraments spurious, and all their acts displeasing and dishonoring to God. In which the Protestant E. Chuch is represented as the only true Church, having the only true ministry, and the only life giving sacraments; being in every sense the Apostolic Church, received just as it now is by a continuous unbroken chain from the hands of Jesus Christ; and all these modest assumptions are presented as matters about which there has been no dispute, until within a few years;—that the whole current of church history is upon their side of the question, and, if proof is adduced, a few quotations from some of "the fathers," to which not one

out of a thousand can have access, and less would have patience, to plod through their ascetic nonsense, to see whether the quotation was correct, and whether or not the same father or some one of his contemporaries did not assert the contrary. Such productions, after suitable preparation by kind acts and a manifested interest in the person's welfare are placed by the minister or his deputy, perhaps, a FEMALE, into the hands of a regular communicant in another church, accompanied with assurances of the highest regard for their denomination, and their minister—with expressions of unwillingness to produce hostile feelings between the two; and that nothing but an ardent desire for them to know the truth, has induced them to present the tracts. After perusing these productions, suitable oral instruction as the subject will bear is imparted. The advantages of *the Church*, its freedom from all excitement and discussion with which human organizations are troubled, are most beautifully portrayed. The great wealth, learning, benevolence, laxity or strictness of the discipline of the Church, are varied in the representation, according to the condition of the patient. Sometimes the Church is aristocratical; sometimes republican; sometimes Calvanistic; and then forsooth Arminian. Now requiring a change of heart; and anon making no such demand. To one, the door is wide enough to receive as to faith Universalism, Unitarianism, and all other isms, and to permit a practice of all the maxims and pursuits of the world. To another, it is so narrow, that no heresy, no sinful indulgence, can make an entrance. This is their process of *unchurching* their neighbors; and here I have sketched no more than has been elucidated not a thousand miles from the place where I write.

For thus unceremoniously entering other communions an apology is due them. It is not probable, that they look upon this ecclesiastical robbery in the light of theft; for considering themselves as having received the whole patrimony of Jesus Christ in this world, to whom the ends of the earth are given for a possession, they claim the fee simple is in them; and, lay hold of the communicants of other churches with no more conscientious scruples than the owner of a stolen horse in seizing the property thus unlawfully taken from him. As the claim, however, is not easily made out, the necessity of art in effecting the seizure will be apparent. This is the best apology that I can make for their inroads upon other Churches. But as we do not admit their claim, and affirm, that the chain of title cannot be traced, and that if it could the exclusive grant is nowhere to be found in the original conveyance, the public must not think strange if we pronounce this "*unchurching scheme*" an officious intermeddling with their neighbors business, and their neighbors property.

Having thus unchurched their subject, and suitably inducted

him into the mysteries of high Churchism—(for they believe in a gradual not an instantaneous work)—he is, without a rebaptism, (this sacrament which they declare to be the condition of salvation—the link that unites them with Christ—being omitted) brought to the altar, where after receiving the imposition of hands by the Bishop, through whom saving grace is imparted, he is pronounced CHURCHED! He is now, where he never was before, in THE Church. Whether these subjects, thus secured from the ranks and evils of schism, are in subsequent life more holy, more heavenly minded, more zealous in the cause of Christ in doing good to the souls and bodies of men than they were before they left these spurious Churches, *the people* can judge, as a few living examples may be found in this and other communities by which the comparison may easily be made, and the test of our Savior “by their fruits ye shall know them” readily applied.

It may be a matter of surprise to some, as it was to me, to learn, that after having laid such stress upon the sacraments, after having made them indispensable to salvation, they should so readily dispense with one of them. For if these “self constituted” teachers, have the right to administer one sacrament, why have they not the right to administer the other? Baptism is just as sacred—just as important as the Lords Supper—yea if any thing more so, as it is the act say they by which we enter the fold of Christ—are united to Christ. If it requires a prelatical Bishop to convey the right to administer the Lords Supper to those united to Christ, does it not require the same officer to convey the right to thus unite them? Now, these spurious ministers, of these spurious Churches, either have or have not the right to administer Baptism. If they have the right, why this hue and cry about our not having the sacraments, not being members of the Church? But if they have not the right, then those persons received from other Churches without a rebaptism, are not baptized; and if not baptized, according to their own doctrine, they are not members of Christ’s Church; and hence, after all this process, they are no more churched than they were before. I would call the attention of some of the communicants of St. James to this fact. And particularly so, as Mr. Bolles was bred a Presbyterian, and as I understand did not unite himself to *the* Church until he had arrived to manhood. I am not aware, indeed that he was rebaptized. The belief is general here, and his own practice would confirm that belief, that he was never rebaptized; or in Church language, has *never* been baptized. If this be so, I would, most seriously, advise the Rector to see to it, that he may be sure he is in *the* Church himself, before he so officiously tenders his services to Church the communicants of other Churches.

After all, this work of unchurching is not a very thankful or

profitable business. True, it is, Mr. B. says, that this attempt to defend our Churches against these attacks originated in fear, in "being alarmed on account of so many becoming tired of the evils of schism and returning to the bosom of the Church." This is altogether a gratuitous assumption, and, as usual, unaccompanied with any proof. Reference to the annual reports of different Churches will show, that there was no ground of alarm. The small increase of Protestant Episcopalians last year, when placed by the side of more than the one hundred thousand addition to our Church during the same time, is not very alarming to the ranks of schism. Besides we have the more commendable item, that this large addition was secured principally from the world; while theirs according to the declaration of one of their prelates, was taken from their neighbors fold. Rather the rapid march of other Churches, the large additions made through the glorious revivals with which they have been blessed for a few of the last years, has alarmed the successional ranks and aroused them to acts of desperation, exhibiting a willingness to use if need be the instruments of religious torture. But all such reckless attacks upon these Churches that have been so wonderfully blessed of God will react upon themselves, and, in the end both God and man will have them in derision.

It is a matter of rejoicing, that the people have too much sense to believe that Jesus Christ has made over his right and title in his Church to a corporation of Bishops, and constituted all on whomsoever they may lay their hands, irrespective of moral character, the Prophets, Priests, and Kings of his spiritual domain; and, hence, notwithstanding their unwearied efforts, the process of unchurching and churching brings in but a small increase. For some who have been thus metamorphosed into Churchmen do not stay churched but come back again to the ranks of schism; and others, the number of whom is daily increasing in these days of revivals, who have been trained up from infancy in *the* Church, and are well acquainted with the *forms* of devotion, becoming awakened and converted to God through the instrumentality of these spurious ministers, consider it best to find a home where resides the *power* as well as the form of godliness. It is true, if they really believe that Jesus Christ has committed exclusively to them the power to communicate salvation to the human race, that they alone can convey the authority to preach the gospel and administer those sacraments which are "the promise and pledge of pardon," they, certainly, should be active, not to unchurch others but to impart to them this "life giving power." What if the Presbyterians, and Baptists, and Methodists, do differ from Protestant Episcopalians on some points of theology, there is not sufficient difference to warrant their withholding from them this inestimable treasure. Matters of

faith, according to the Rector, are of minor importance to this Apostolic succession, and men will differ on points of doctrine. Why then do not his Bishops offer to assist in the ordination of Ministers in these other organizations, so that they may be true Churches and have a true ministry, with the true sacraments? Surely the benevolence of the gospel would prompt them to make the offer; and if they were repulsed, why they would be exempt, and on these organizations would the guilt of remaining in schism be rolled. But have they made this offer? Not once! Are they then sincere in the importance which they attach to this feature of their system? Have these schismatics sought at their hands the impartation of this divine gift, and have they been rejected? By their own showing Dr. Coke asked them for it, and this certainly was the time for them to exhibit the spirit and benevolence of the gospel by correcting the wrong in Methodism. Here were a large body of people, who according to their doctrine were without salvation and as Mr. B. would have us believe, knocking at their door for the bread of life; and by a simple act of theirs, without a cent expense, they could put us all in the way to heaven. To refuse; to turn us away, would be an act of indifference to our future welfare that would ill accord with christian philanthropy; and yet, strange to tell, they withheld from us the gracious boon, and now taunt us with our poverty! If, however, we are at last, lost for the want of this *sine qua non*, at whose door will the guilt of our damnation be found? I charge them, then, with either *selfishness* or *insincerity*. The most charitable construction is, that they do not themselves consider this one thing so essential to the existence of a Church, and that the object of the cry they have raised against us and the other churches, not Episcopal in their sense of the term, is to build up their own hierarchy at our expense.

What he says about my "having denied them the right to think and act for themselves; of holding their faith in a pure conscience; of enjoying it in kindness and in charity," I would only remark; that I know not in what or how I have done this great wrong, and he has not pointed this out, but simply made the assertion. Certain it is that either with or without right, he has thought, and wrote, and published not only what he thought and wrote, but what his neighbor thought and wrote for a very different purpose. If he has held his faith in an *impure* instead of a *pure* conscience, it is a matter between him and his God. I beg to be excused from being announced as the cause of its impurity. And whether he has enjoyed it in kindness or unkindness—in that charity that thinketh no evil, or in that envy that imagineth all kinds of evil, the public will soon be able to judge. What he says about its being "a cunning artifice to prevent the people from making a serious and solemn examination into the

matter," is a mere assumption that has no foundation in fact, and will never be credited by any who are familiar with the history of prelatical supremacy. What has produced reformation and more than once made this whole hierarchy tremble? The diffusion of knowledge! What has contributed to its advancement? Ignorance; always! And one reason why these principles have advanced in this country as far as they have, is the fact, that however much enlightened on other subjects, both preachers and people have slumbered over this and neglected either to inform themselves upon it, or those committed to their charge. The storm at last has aroused them. The old musty records of the Church will be examined. The deformity of the best of their authors, will be shown, so clearly, that it can be detected by the people though now disguised by all the art that Jesuitism can bestow. Let me inform the Rector, that there will be an examination, both by the clergy and laity, to the hearts content of all high Churchmen. Knowledge, to these claims will be what free principles are to despotism. So says, not merely a prelate, but an arch-prelate, who perhaps is as well acquainted with this matter as the Rev. Gentleman at St. James. Archbishop Whately, D. D., says "it is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning; deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection; decry appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of reading should be imparted to the *people*. It is not without cause, that they dread and lament, 'an age of too much light,' and wish to involve religion in 'a solemn and awful gloom.' It is not without cause, that having removed the christian's confidence from a rock, to base it on sand, they forbid all prying curiosity to examine their foundation." If our successional friend was not afraid of light, why such a commotion, merely because I preached four Sermons upon our defense, while he has preached more than four times four as the assailant? It is true, he is not much alarmed while he can control the kind of light emitted, but when his neighbor proceeds to lift the other corner of the curtain it becomes a very different business.

To his very modest classification by which he places himself by the side of Moses, Jesus Christ, and the Apostles, and my humble self with Korah, and his successors in schism, I shall make no reply, believing the public will admit the latter when, and not till when, they become convinced of the fitness of the former; for however much this classification may please his vanity I hardly think the community are ready to award him a place quite so near either of the associates he has named. I have now gone through with a part of what he says about "reproachful epithets," and I ask the reader again to pause and inquire, who is guilty of bearing false witness against his neighbor?

CHAP X.

Mr. Bolles' charges, continued—unworthy epithets—“Jesuitical.”

The term “Jesuitical” seems to awaken in Mr. B. a great degree of sensitiveness. He exhibits a wonderful and peculiar condition of uneasiness and commotion in its application to himself, and evidently dislikes the idea of being identified with the ultra and erroneous views of that deceitful school. In my letter to Mr. Bolles, and in my article published in the Northern Advocate, I intimated, that the course taken by him in this controversy was highly tinctured with Jesuitism. His reply to these intimations, is an effort, on his part, to divert the attention of those who have watched his proceedings, from the true channel, and to take the question away from before the public as the tribunal before which his answer should be made. This step only serves to confirm the belief that my intimations were well and truly founded; for if they were not so, why does he not prove them false? The Rector has not shown any unwillingness to investigate in *time*, any and all matters which he felt himself competent to notice. The public as the bar before which he has brought the issue—the tribunal is one of his own selection, to which I am ready to submit all matters at variance, and I, therefore, claim it to be proper to bring this question also before that tribunal; having thus the privilege of vindication before the same body that the accusation has been made. Let us see then in what Jesuitism consists and thus compare the principles, and evils, and errors of it, with the acts and sentiments of Mr. Bolles.

The sect denominated Jesuits, or the Society of Jesus, as it has, likewise, been called, was founded, by Ignatius Loyola, in the year 1540. The object of the institution was to assist in supporting and extending the influence of the Roman Pontiff, whose power had begun to be shaken by the light of the Reformation. To give an air of sanctity to the sect, they assumed the name of Jesus. The acts of the order were all founded upon policy or expediency and were marked by the display of cunning and deceit. To secure their object, they were never shackled with the principles of *honor, morality, or religion*. They sought for influence with people of rank and power by presenting a system of the most relaxed morality, suited to the taste of the most crafty politician. To those of stricter principles they endeavored to recommend themselves by the austerity of their doctrines.

As Abbe Boileau has said, "they are a sort of people who lengthen the creed and shorten the decalogue." Chameleon-like, their creed is ever changing, being colored to suit the subject and permitting the convert to retain whatever of his former opinion he is disposed. In India claiming descent from Brama—in America to the Indians declaring that "Jesus Christ had been a valiant and victorious warrior, who, in the space of three years had scalped an incredible number of men, women, and children." Arrogating to themselves peculiar prerogatives as the favorites of heaven, and disfranchising all who are not of their sect. Bigoted as a Pharisee, yet flexible as a gum elastic jacket, they were

"A protean tribe, one knows not what to call,
Which shifts to every form, and shines in all,
Grammarian, painter, augur, rhetorician,
Rope-dancer, conjurer, fiddler, and physician."

In identifying Mr. Bolles with a sect possessing such a variety of properties, it was not my intention to extend the analogy to all the characteristics above enumerated; though the assumption of peculiar prerogatives by the high Church party—claiming for their prelates the exclusive title of "*Apostolical Bishops*," and for themselves "**THE Church**"—"THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES"—the course pursued here and elsewhere in the reception of members, irrespective of *character* or *creed*, would not make even such a task very difficult. Indeed such are the principles and such the policy of the Oxfordmen, in England, that they have there already secured the appellation of "*Jesuits*." As their coadjutor and apologist in this country, Mr. B. must not think it strange if the same epithet should be applied to him. My only design however, was to say, that the course pursued by Mr. B. in this controversy, bore some resemblance to Jesuitism in that want of honor, candor, frankness, and justice which so strikingly characterized the doings of this order. And I must here call the attention of the reader to a few, out of a large class of similar facts, as illustrating and establishing the propriety of my reference, and thereby clearing me from the charge of using "unworthy epithets."

The work which I am now reviewing was advertised under the following title, "The Episcopal Church Defended, with an examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy; in a series of letters addressed to the Rev. Allen Steele, with his replies, by James A. Bolles, Rector of St. James Church, Batavia, N. Y." This title page declares first that the work shall contain two series of letters, one from the pen of each of the persons named, and second it definitely sets forth the subjects discussed in those letters. It declares, that the letters from Rev. James A. Bolles shall contain a defense of the Episcopal Church and an examin-

ation into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy—and that my letters shall be replies to such defense, and examination. It also claims that the work will be as much a Methodist Episcopal as a Protestant Episcopal book; and, hence it was calculated as much to recommend itself to the friends of the one as to the friends of the other. The impression made upon the public mind by this title page was, that the work would contain letters being a regular discussion, by the parties named, of the comparative claims of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy.

To have an appearance of justice and to seem to correspond with the announcement of the title page, such of my letters as Mr. B. was disposed to insert are placed in different parts of the book as regular replies to all the matter preceding them, and no note to the reader, informing him what part of his was, and what part was not sent to me, nor whether mine were written as private letters or with a view to publication was appended; thereby making an impression upon the readers mind, that all that preceded each of my letters was before me when I wrote them; and what was published were such replies and all the reply, that I wished to make to the public. Indeed Mr. Bolles says, at the close of his work, "Mr. Steele had an opportunity of replying to every thing which he chose at the time." He further states, that I was "among the first persons to whom the prospectus of this work was shown" and, therefore, at the time I must have considered every thing correct. To secure a favorable reception, both among Protestant and Methodist Episcopalian, where I was not known, he declares, that I am "considered the most able, learned, and eloquent preacher of the Methodist *denomination*, in this section of the country." Now, what are the facts in the case. My letters so far from being replies to his defense of the Episcopal Church and his examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy, contain not a word in the form of discussion on either of the subjects, nor, indeed, did I have before me either his defense or examination at the time I wrote my letters. My letters were on another subject. They contained a brief notice of some personal matters; and, he states, himself, in his work, and so reported it through the village, that I had utterly refused to discuss with him the subjects named on his title page. After such written and oral statements, he advertises and sends forth a work, which he declares contains replies from my pen to his defense of the Episcopal Church and his examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy!! So far from my having as he says, "an opportunity of replying to every thing I chose at the time," I knew not what he was going to publish, nor did I know what he had written, until the book was issued. What kind of an opportunity I had to reply can readily be conceived. It is true, when I answered his first letter I had all the preceding mat-

ter before me, except the title page and advertisement to the reader, and had an opportunity of saying all that I wished to say to that communication as a private correspondence. This is the only letter from me that can be considered a regular reply to either of his; but this letter, surely, cannot be considered as a reply for publication. My subsequent letters are merely notes on some personal matters, and an attempt to settle preliminary arrangements for a regular and honorable discussion. The second and third letters as found in his work, are preceded by fifty pages from him, twenty of which I never saw until it was printed! The fourth note from me is preceded by one hundred pages more from him not one sentence of which had I seen until presented in the book—and then when he informs me that he is going to the press with my letters, he says, his columns are full and he can receive no further communication from me. Yet Mr. B. says “Mr. Steele had an opportunity of replying to every thing which he chose at the time”!!

Instead of my being among the first persons to whom the *Prospectus* of this work was shown, I was neither among the *first* nor the *last* persons to whom it was *ever* shown by any order or sanction of Mr. Bolles. I did not see it until it had been circulated by him or his agents in this and other communities—until I had been repeatedly told by Methodists, that it was so worded they had subscribed for it under the impression that it would contain a regular discussion of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy, and that if what I had written to Mr. B. contained no such discussion, they considered it my duty to correct the errors there set forth. Then it was that I obtained a sight of the *Prospectus*; not by the order of Mr. Bolles, but through the kindness of a friend upon my own request. Under circumstances connected with these facts, I was induced to have an article inserted in the *Northern Advocate* advising my friends of the error set forth in the *prospectus*. This article Mr. B. thinks should have been sent to him. Had he merited any such attention? Did he deserve any such courtesy? Was such his governing views in not sending me the *prospectus* of a work, in which it would be supposed from the statements there made, that I should have some interest? And yet he says, “Mr. Steele was among the first persons to whom the *Prospectus* of this work was shown!!!”

So far from my being “considered the most able, learned and eloquent preacher of the Methodist denomination in this section of the country,” it is well known that nothing is further from truth. I have never occupied any prominent place in our Church —have never been distinguished by any act—have been but a humble Methodist Minister, “little and unknown,” except in the limited circle in which I have moved; nor have I any desire for any such eminence as Mr. B. gives me. Can he be ignorant of

the fact, that we have many ministers in our Church distinguished in the literary and scientific world? To show how *sincere* Mr. Bolles was in this fictitious elevation of his opponent, it will only be necessary to notice, that these letters of mine were read by him to clergymen of other denominations, and by his permission passed to social circles beyond his habitation and read there in connection with the severest criticisms and strictures. Every effort was made by the Rector to induce the public to believe, that I was not only deficient in the higher departments of science, but ignorant of the orthography of our own language; and so industrious was he in extending this impression, that it became a matter of grave discussion in the bar-rooms of our village, whether I actually knew how to spell or not the ordinary words of the English language. Doubtful whether this course was sufficient to create that degree of prejudice which Mr. B. seemed to desire should exist, one of his communicants reported, that the sermons I preached were previously prepared by some of the most talented ministers of our Church, and I was sent here to preach them for the purpose of putting down Protestant Episcopalianism. The last edition of such stories which I have heard of their using, is, that *they were written by my wife!!* Finally, to fix the stigma of ignorance upon me, after securing from the printer a pledge of secrecy, until the work was completed, Mr. B. demands from him that my *private* letters should be printed just as they were in the manuscript. To illustrate this liberal instruction to the printer, one circumstance may be sufficient. The word "*tact*" was spelled in my letter "*tack*." The printer discovering that it must have been a mistake changed it to "*tact*." Mr. Bolles on seeing it in the proof, (which shows how much his attention was absorbed in this matter, for some *hundred* errors in his letters escaped his notice,) he came immediately to the office and reproved the printer for thus changing the orthography of the word. The printer replied, that he had corrected a number of words in *his* manuscript, and as I had no opportunity to correct mine, it would certainly be no more than honorable and right to correct it, as the spelling would not effect in any way, the argument; but the Rector was inflexible, and the printer had to yield; hence it reads in the book, "*tack*," instead of *tact*. It may be claimed, that as the proof of the first letter was sent me, had I consented to correct it I might have prevented this. I would say in reply, that this is not certain, for as I had no control over the press, I might not have been permitted to change from the manuscript; and had I consented to correct the proof, he, doubtless, would have stated that my letters were published with my consent and with my own corrections. How do these circumstances compare with the statement of Mr. B. that I was "*the most able, learned and eloquent preacher of the Methodist denomination in this section*

of the country?" Here is a specimen of high Church *honor* and *magnanimity*!!! Let the reader look over these items embraced in the *manner* of getting up this work and then decide if this is not Jesuitism? Does such conduct evince that Mr. B. held the *frankness*, the *honesty* of a christian? Or does it conform to the policy of a Jesuit? What must we think of a cause that needs a defense conducted on such principles? What opinion must we form of periodicals who hail such a production as one of which *the Church* may justly be proud? As Mr. B. has adopted the policy of a Jesuit he must not think it strange if he is classed with that order; and, however ignorant I may be of the word "*tact*," I think the public will award me with having justly "*tacked*" the name of a Jesuit upon him.

In this manner of getting up works Mr. Bolles does not act without a precedent. It is the common policy of high Churchmen at the present day. Take for instance tract No. 4. Its title is "Methodism as held by Wesley." Its matter is made up of extracts from the writings of Mr. Wesley, interspersed with notes explanatory and inferential, in which, every principle of correct reasoning is violated; and it is sent out into the world, not "the Methodism of Mr. Wesley as explained and defined by a high Churchman," but under the specious title of "Methodism as held by Wesley"! Now it no more contains "Methodism as held by Wesley," than a certain infidel work does "Theology as taught in the Scriptures," which work is made up of extracts from the Bible; and by uniting passages irrespective of their original connection, it is made to sanction the greatest enormities and basest crimes. Suppose the infidel, when charged by the christian with injustice should reply as Mr. Bolles replies when charged with the same in tract No. 4, "that these are the doctrines of the Bible I cannot deny, for I have just quoted them from a book published by christians which they call the Bible." Would this be candid? Because Mr. B. or the author of tract No. 4, makes correct quotations from the writings of Mr. Wesley is no evidence that he justly gives the *sentiments* of Mr. Wesley! The Bible says "there is no God," but is the Bible the teacher of Atheism? The Bible says "let him that stole steal," but does the Bible sanction theft? And yet this would not be a greater perversion of the doctrines of the Scriptures, than there is, of the sentiments of Mr. Wesley in relation to American Methodists, in tract No. 4! Other works produced under equally deceptive titles, and circulated in this community by Protestant Episcopalianists might be noticed; but the above must suffice.

If we examine the *matter* of Mr. Bolles' work instances illustrative of his Jesuitism are almost numberless. I will notice only one or two. First, his invitation to discuss the merits of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy. This is found in his first let-

ter. This invitation in my reply I accepted, provided we could agree upon the preliminary questions necessary to be settled before proceeding to such a discussion. Without any such settlement of the question or questions to be discussed, or the rules that were to govern the controversy, he proceeds to argue the subject. I replied, objecting to the course he had taken; stating, that I could not consent to proceed to such an examination without the ground being definitely marked out, and the laws to be observed established, so that each party might know *what* his task was, and *how* it was to be performed. To this he made no reply, but circulated through the village that he was going to publish our correspondence and sought to justify himself on the ground that I had refused to travel with him, when so far from refusing, I had accepted of his invitation, provided we could agree upon the vehicle and the conditions of the journey. Because I requested that these should be settled before pledging myself to take passage, he reports, that I had refused to travel with him altogether! and then, at the conclusion of his book, says in an emphatic manner, "*If you will take up the subject of Episcopacy, or any other subject connected with the Episcopal Church, and discuss it in writing, in any shape you please, and settling your own preliminaries, then, I engage to follow you, and we will publish it either in numbers or when the whole correspondence is finished.*" Is there no Jesuitism here? The whole farce, for such it may be called, is designed to impress the reader with the idea that, notwithstanding my ready acceptance of his proposition—when his reply to my first letter—(though only about half as long as the one found in his work)—came to hand I was so perfectly astounded as to be unwilling to risk any further encounter with him! Of the truthfulness of such an impression the reader can judge after perusing the pages of this work.

This last proposition contains all the art of a Jesuit. Its surface is exceedingly smooth, and to some, no doubt, it would look like a very fair proposition. Let us examine it. In all the controversies between Methodist and Protestant Episcopalians, the former have always acted on the defensive, the latter having been the assailants. It is true, as in this case, they have sought, in many instances, after having entered the contest, by management to turn the tables and claimed to be defending *the Church* instead of attacking the Methodists; but an enlightened public have generally been able to discover the art. Take the book I am reviewing, and though called "*the Episcopal Church Defended*," yet, in fact what is it, but "*the Methodist Episcopal Church attacked*"? Mr. Bolles, after having for a year, by sermons from his pulpit, by tracts he has circulated, by a pamphlet he has published, assailed our institutions, and proscribed us as out of the pale of the Christian Church; and after publishing to the world

that I had declined a controversy with him, proposes at the close of his book, that *now*, if I will take up any subject connected with the Episcopal Church, and settling my own preliminaries, he will *follow me!* This is quite marvellous. Having become tired of leading he will *now follow me!* That is, if I will assail the Protestant Episcopal Church, he will pledge himself to try to defend it! Has he *been trying* to defend? True, his work is entitled a defense of his Church! and he has charged me, repeatedly, "with attacking the Church" and "holding them up to the scorn and ridicule of the world." Why, then, the necessity of thus inviting me to assail them? Why this pledging to follow me if I have in all this time been the assailant, and he has been following me in the defense? Who does not see in this proposition an acknowledgment that I have not as yet taken up any subject connected with his Church, and, consequently, not attacked them—that in all this controversy he has not been defending his Church but assailing his neighbors?

To this proposition to discuss I reply, first, I ask no such privilege of settling preliminary questions *myself* as he here proposes; for however convenient to him, such a course might be, all I ask is, that *both* parties in controversies be pledged to the observance of just, and equal rules. Second, I am not so fond of fighting as to lead off in an offensive war; hence, with whatever Jesuitical skill he may seek to make up an issue that will place him on the defense, on no such ground shall I meet him; nothing but offensive action will draw me into polemical discussion. I have other work to do than to provoke theological controversy by assailing the institutions of sister Churches. Inasmuch as Mr. B. has, voluntarily, placed himself on the lead, he can remain there, until he becomes weary; and, if it is well doing, he should not be weary. When however he becomes so, he is at liberty to retire, not however by changing positions with me—the tables must remain as he placed them—I prefer to follow. His proposition to discuss the merits of Protestant and Methodist Episcopacy I claim is a striking illustration of his Jesuitical policy. This specimen from the *matter* of his work must suffice.

Specimens of his want of candor and justice might be taken from almost every page of Mr. B's book. On these, however, I cannot dwell long; to a few only will I allude. When I propose certain questions to him, asking a direct answer, yes or no, is it candid for him to reply by saying, they have virtually been answered before, when no answer to them had been given? Is it honest or just for him to publish, that I have repeated to my congregation the story of Pope Joan, when I never repeated that story to any congregation in Batavia or elsewhere? Is it honest or just for him to say, that I attempted in my Lectures to prove that Bishops and Presbyters were the same *order*, and claimed our

ordination through a succession of Presbyters in the corrupt Church of Rome, when no such attempt was made, nor no such claim was urged? Is it honest or just for him to say, that I pledged myself to my people, that I would break every link in the succession, when no such pledge was ever given? Is it just for him to charge me with attacking his Church when I was simply defending our own? Is it just for him to charge me with having circulated a false report—of having exaggerated and tortured the truth—of having slandered Bishop De Lancey, by simply reading a communication addressed to me from the officers of our Church? A communication that contained no slanderous statement.

After having introduced the subject of a subscription by telling us that he drew it up himself—that his people subscribed liberally, and when I propose an examination that we may see how the claim of gratitude stands, was it candid for Mr. B. to excuse himself by saying that “subscriptions of money are not the only substantial proofs of friendship”! True, they are not the only substantial proofs of friendship generally, but they are one proof and the only kind of proof he had introduced. This manner of forcing inferences upon the reader which the premises will not warrant may be put down as among the most artful sophistry of Mr. Bolles. Why does he not frankly admit, what is the truth, that there is no possible claim for any other kind of friendship, from his Church than such as he would make out from the paltry amount of contributions over which he has created so much prattling?

When Mr. B. wished to show that the Methodist Episcopal Church is anti-Republican in her polity, and that the Laity have no rights in the government of our Church, was it candid for him to write to a *Protestant* Methodist to obtain such information? Did he *truly* go over the ground he wished to canvass? And are the answers thus received and published a *true* representation of the Economy of our Church? But, I forbear,—the specimens are almost innumerable. The same policy will be seen extending through all his examination of Methodist Episcopacy, indeed through the entire work. Instead of that ingenuousness that we might expect from a *true* Minister of Christ, in the *true* succession, we find that low and degrading species of cunning and artfulness which have ever characterized the doings of the Jesuits of Rome. Is it not evident then, that Mr. B. having thus practiced upon the policy of that order, has justly exposed himself to all the identification I have made, and, that hence I am not guilty of applying “unworthy epithets,” in saying his course in this controversy is strongly tinctured with Jesuitism.

CHAP XI.

Mr. Bolles' charges continued—I had ridiculed his doctrine of Succession—a doctrine which he affirms I should respect for the following reasons: First, I "believe in some kind of succession" myself—Second, "It constitutes the only safeguard of the church against schism and heresy with which Churches that reject it are rent."

Mr. Bolles, seems to consider that I designed to ridicule, and in fact, avers, that I have ridiculed the doctrine of Apostolical Succession; and hence he advises me to be more cautious in the future. While I would express suitable gratitude for any advice which may be given me, especially from one who lays such claims to infallibility, I would also, state, that in this instance it seems to have been entirely uncalled for; as I apprehend can be clearly shown by the following reasons. First, I am not aware of having been guilty of any such criminal act as the one of which he complains; and as he has furnished no proof nor given any "specifications" I cannot, of course, make any special reply, but must simply say, that without reference to premises whereon such charges can rest, one will fail to perceive the application of the rebuke. Second, the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, as now set forth by Mr. B. and the high Church party, is, in itself, so perfectly ridiculous, that any attempt to ridicule it would be a work of supererogation. Nevertheless as he has seen fit to make the charge and to offer some reasons why I should be more cautious in the future, it may be proper to examine them and see how far they do in fact recommend his Succession scheme as worthy of being held in high estimation and treated with reverence.

The first reason he assigns why I should be more cautious how I ridicule Apostolical Succession, is, that I believe in some kind of Succession myself. He asks, "do you not believe in some kind of Succession yourself?" He does not seem to know positively whether I believe in any or not, but thinks it is possible that I believe in *some* kind of succession, I ought, therefore, to be very cautious how I ridicule *his* succession—"some succession." He, here admits, there are more kinds of succession than one, and, that the one claimed by us is different from that claimed by him. True, the one is made up of all God's ministers of every denomination of Christians—a line formed by God himself. The

latter is a succession formed by a corporation of Bishops without any interference of the Almighty. Succession, then, seems by his admission to be a generic term—Apostolic succession, as defined by high Churchmen, a *species*. Because one of these species is evil, does it follow that none of them are good? In speaking of one of them as a fit subject of ridicule do I, therefore, ridicule all of them? This is a kind of logic not taught among dissenters; but which may be found on almost every page of the work I am now reviewing.

The phrase “Apostolic Succession,” as used by high Churchmen whether found in England or America, is thus understood, that, “there are three, and only three, essentially distinct ministerial orders, divinely ordained to be universally and perpetually binding upon the Church of Christ. So that without them there can be no true Church, or valid Christian Ministry, or ordinances; and, that of these orders the first, as inherently and essentially distinct and supreme by divine appointment and right, has, alone and exclusively, the power and authority to ordain other ministers; and that all this is apparent from God’s own word as an essential part of the Christian revelation. That these three orders were first, Jesus Christ, as High Priest, the Apostles, as Priests or Presbyters, the seventy Disciples, as Deacons, that before Jesus Christ ascended he elevated the Apostles, placing them, in his stead, as the High Priests and Governors of the Church, investing them with all his own authority, giving them plenipotentiary powers to act in his name and behalf, so that whatsoever should be done by them or their successors, (they having the exclusive power to perpetuate their order and the two inferior grades,) would be the same as done by himself”; and, that too, irrespective of “heresy, schism, the most extreme wickedness, or any thing else in the person possessing this power.” That this order is the only source of all spiritual and ecclesiastical authority, and that they, the Church of England, and *the Church of the United States*, alias Protestant Episcopal Church, have this authority transmitted through an uninterrupted historical series of persons, thus validly ordained, from the Apostles down to the present generation. That any people, however pious and successful in bringing men to the truth as it is in Jesus, who have not this personal succession thus defined, and these orders of the ministry thus set forth, have no authorized ministry, no sacraments, no covenant, no Church; but are out of the Church, out of the covenant, out of the promise of God’s mercy and favor, out of the pledge and assurance of salvation; “are treading in the footsteps of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram”—vide Tracts for the Times, Bishop Taylor’s Episcopacy Asserted, Dr. Hicks on the Dignity of the Episcopal Order, Dr. Hooke on the Church and the Establishment, Bishop Hobart’s Companion for the Al-

tar, Bishop McCosky on Episcopal Bishops, and tract No. 5 as circulated by Mr. Bolles and the Tract Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Again, also by Bishop Beveridge, who declares, that by virtue of the imposition of hands by one of these successors, the same spirit which was breathed by our Lord into his Apostles is imparted, for this spirit, acts, moves, and assists in all the administrations of all these successors, in our days, as much as ever. Who that has read the lives of the gentlemen placed in their catalogue, will believe this. Men, whom their own biographers call "monsters of mankind," nevertheless had the spirit of the Apostles! Or by Dodwell who places these succession Bishops above Jesus Christ, declaring that without *them* no soul can be united to *Him*—"none but the Bishops can unite us to the Father and the Son"! What has become of the thousands who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ but never saw one of these Apostolic Bishops? Let the Bible and common sense answer. The doctrine is as false as it is arrogant; a doctrine "that would FORGE A CHAIN TO BIND HEAVEN AND EARTH, GOD AND MAN, TO THE ACTS OF PRIESTLY ARROGANCE. Allow this doctrine, and, though *Satan and his host incarnate* should become ordained by succession Bishops," they, alone, could unite us with Jesus Christ; and no ordinances but those administered by his Satanic Majesty would be valid!! This is "Apostolical Succession." Such as is taught and circulated by Mr. Bolles. A kind of succession which, in connection with its appendages, I reject. Against the *fact* of this succession, stript of what is appended to it, the ministerial right and authority, which they found upon it I would not inveigh; for in, and of itself it matters not whether it is true or false. If there has been such a succession, well; if not, just as well. The evil is in the abuse which has added the above appendages to it, and made it a huge monster, much resembling anti-Christ—a description of which may be found in the 13th chap. of the Apocalypse—the making it a sine qua non to the existence of a Church, of salvation, of heaven! In making it that on which the Bible and Christianity are dependant for their existence and influence. It is the putting forth of these extravagant claims by the daughter and grand-daughter of Rome, that has provoked examination, and which has resulted in satisfying many minds, not only, that these claims are unfounded, but, that the personal succession is, as a prelate said, "dark and muddy as the Tiber itself"; or as Wesley said, "a fable which no man ever did or can prove." And yet Mr. B. says, I believe in some kind of a succession. Most certainly I do, but it is a succession "of faith, of truth, of doctrine, of holiness, and love." Where these are found there is the true succession. Where we find the faith of the gospel, the truth of the gospel, the doctrine of the gospel,

the holiness of life which the gospel requires, there is the christian in the true succession. Where these are found in the minister, there is the true minister, in the regular succession of the Waldenses, the Lollards, Luther, Melancton, Calvin, Zungle, Knox, the Puritans, Wesley's, Whitfield, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewell—in God's succession; their names enrolled in the Lamb's book of life, though not in the succession tables of the high Churchman. This is the true succession, and a Church without it is, as Whitaker says, "like a dead carcass without a soul." Or as Chillingworth calls it, "a corruption of Christianity."

I believe in this succession; "that the Lord Jesus Christ, through successive generations, has preserved and transmitted the grand essential facts of Christianity and the knowledge of its elementary doctrines, by means of a succession of authentic writings; and has influenced, qualified, and called by His spirit a succession of men, whom, HE has authorized to proclaim those facts and doctrines. Such a succession, in accordance with Archbishop Whately, I believe and teach; but it is nothing more nor less than the perpetuation of the truth and of the Church in the world, by men called and chosen of God to discharge the functions of ministers and office bearers in His house." I believe, that Jesus Christ has the exclusive right, as the great Head of the Church, of calling, choosing, commissioning, and clothing His ministers with power. That ordination answers to the oath of office, and induction into it, being the public formal recognition of the fact, that Jesus Christ has exercised His Headship in the appointment of the man as His ambassador—that it is not to *make* a minister; but to *acknowledge* one that God has made—that the succession depends not on the flow of authority from Bishop, to Bishop, Priest and Deacon, regularly conveyed or transferred, as Mr. Bolles teaches; but on the will and grace, the spirit and providence of Jesus Christ, our only sovereign, lord, and king. That the list of successors is of no more consequence to prove the right to exercise official power from Jesus Christ, than is the list of Mr. Bolles' predecessors, who have officiated as Rectors of St. James' Church to prove the legitimacy of his right to officiate as their Rector—than does the list of Presidents, to prove the right of the present incumbent. Personal succession does not enter into that right as any part of its elements. I would honor Jesus Christ, and trace all official power and authority directly to Him; discarding, altogether—as one of the engines of oppression and tyranny which have enslaved alike the Church and the world flowing down through a long list of individuals—a privileged order in regular, lineal, legitimate succession.—(*Duffield.*) A succession of truth, of holiness, of Christ's interposition in sending his ambassadors, is the *some* succession

which we hold as indispensably necessary to the existence of a true Church; of a true ministry. Such a succession God has maintained; such a ministry and Church he has ever had upon the earth. Such ministers, the pious of all churches, will believe, that John Wesley, Thomas Coke, and Francis Asbury were "in regular order and succession," Mr. B's sneer to the contrary notwithstanding. Such succession Bishop White believed there might be, without the interposition of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and of such a succession, God forbid that I should speak contemptuously or hold in light esteem. Let Mr. B. be cautious, that he use proper discrimination in administering advice, or he may himself become the proper subject of ridicule.

But, I believe not in this or any succession merely on the ground that Presbyters and Bishops are the same order of ministers as Mr. Bolles suggests. It is one thing to believe that Presbyters have a right to ordain, because they are Presbyters; and another, and very different thing to believe, that they have this right, because it has been handed down by regular order and succession. Mr. B. confounding these, makes his argument unsound and his conclusions, by which he would convince us of inconsistency, ridiculous. The President of the United States has the right to do certain things, not, because that right has been conveyed by Washington in regular order and succession to him; but, because that right is given in the original charter to all who fill that office. If then it can be shown that Presbyters, in the original Church had the right to ordain; if in the original charter this right is recognized; then no man, nor body of men, have a right to take it from them, so long as they fill that office according to the scriptural requirement; so long as their moral qualifications come up to the scriptural standard. This distinction makes all, his otherwise pithy sayings on this point, appear exceedingly foolish, and excites only a smile at his simplicity. This idea of having the power by succession, rather than by coming up to the scriptural requirement, like the divine right of kings to which it is akin, is the very essence of a monarchical government, which, in this country, will meet with its merited scorn and contempt. Is it God's ordinance or man's dicta that gives the right to ordain? This is the question. The former I embrace, the latter is the doctrine of the Rector—the very essence of Popery. Upon this ground it is very easy then to answer his question, "who did John Wesley succeed?" The answer is all God's ministers that have preceded him. Does God's ordinance require that this power shall be handed down through any line? On this point let the charter be searched. The passage has yet to be shown to sustain it, and until it is presented, we treat these exclusive claims with contempt.

We believe that John Wesley, Thomas Coke and Francis As-

bury, were sent of God, and hence were ministers in the true order and succession—ministers of the Lord Jesus, without any scriptural irregularity.* Let the reader bear this distinction in mind always when reading the production of successionists. It ill becomes the Church of England, or her branch here to press this point; for if she reject the ordinance of God as the source of this right, they must trace it to a lay-man, and now to a lay-woman, for it would not be a difficult task to show that their ordination centered in, and was derived from, the King's or Queen's dicta—"the royal mandate under the great seal." Had Mr. B. abided his challenge which I accepted, to discuss the comparative claims of Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy, this point—the origin of power, the right of ordination—would have been fully investigated; but he saw fit to withdraw it and propose that I should challenge him, which of course I have no wish to do claiming to act only on the defensive. We believe it lies in the ordinance of God. We prefer to borrow our succession from Jesus Christ, rather than from Rome or Canterbury, not from any pretended virtue in his incarnate hands, or of the Presbytery that succeeded him, but from the gift of his grace and the Holy Spirit to all that believe. On this foundation we build, both the Church and our hopes; and all of every name who rest here we receive as Christians, asking and enforcing no rites but the simple ordinances significant of the spirit and of the cross; and even these we require not for their own virtue to save, but as symbols of things unseen and spiritual. We look for a ministry called of God, as was Aaron: not sent, as Tetzel from Leo X. We expect from them ministrations of truth—ministrations that shall abase the soul, and exalt God alone in the work of its renewal and reunion to himself. With such a succession we are satisfied; here we have a living *divine right* succession; owned as such by the attending influences of the spirit; the true evidence of an accepted ministry. We affirm, that the mere consent or transmission of power from one set of men to another to administer external ceremonies, can no more unite them to the evangelical, spiritual, and accepted ministry of the Savior's original designation, and entitle their ministrations to human respect and the divine approbation, than the garments of the Rabbies and Priests of the Jewish service can constitute the officiating servants of the Synagogue the true Israel of God. The elements essential to the accredited minister of Christ are not to be found

* Mr. Bolles knew very well, that his quotation on p. 48, from our Minutes of 1789, was simply designed to acknowledge Mr. Wesley's *precedency*; for the note appended, refers to another place in which the idea of the fabulous Apostolic Succession is rejected by the Bishops themselves, thereby guarding it against any such construction as Mr. B. has given. This is a specimen of the Rector's *candor*.

in any thing merely external; and these by whomsoever handed down can form no true succession. The thing is utterly impossible. Neither the qualifications for the ministry nor the succession to its immunities rest here. If the *charter* on which every true Church must be founded and the *spiritual* succession are not there, the nominal descent is but an empty name. If the doctrines and principles of the Bible, Christ and his spirit be not there, the true succession cannot be. The principles and doctrines of the Bible are the *charter* of all ecclesiastical rights, and the *spirit* of these is essential to a valid ministry. We affirm that christians called of God and united in the fellowship and ordinances of the gospel, are a true Church of Christ, both scriptural and Apostolical; and whoever is here set apart for the administration of its ordinances, comes into the possession of a *divine right*, and with proper **SPIRITUAL QUALIFICATIONS**, has all the elements of a true minister of Jesus Christ. We believe that when any body of men become associated upon the principles of the gospel and for the purposes for which it was given, receiving its doctrines and cultivating its spirit, they constitute a true christian Church; and are invested with a divine right, with the powers and immunities of a scriptural succession. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," says the Savior, "there am I in the midst of them." The Bible is our charter; our faith; our law. Here is the right borrowed from God; the succession of a spiritual christianity, which cannot be resolved into mere externals, nor secured by seals, rites, symbols, keys, any, or all of human investments, from which every thing vital and spiritual may have fled. Who would look for the succession of a christian Church and a scriptural ministry in the hordes of merciless and profligate Monks? Or in the "fox hunting" clergy of England? And deny it to Baxter, Cranmer, and Bunyan? Holy men of God, persecuted for righteousness sake, and doing wonders in the name of Christ? We should as soon think of Bonaparte, wasting on his ocean rock, and his wandering family, as the ruling powers of Continental Europe, to the rejection of the rightful sovereigns; or regard the Asphaltic slime-pits, immersing the fallen towers and palaces of Babylon, as the living city of millions. When the spiritual qualifications depart, the commission expires; the divine right passes away; and though the name may sound as lofty and its ministrations be increasingly splendid and costly, all is cold and dead. The shrine may stand beneath the splendid dome and gilded minerets; but the divinity has departed. The Church of Christ and his ministry are not here. We rather look for them with such as Fenelon, though in exile, persecuted, yet radiant in the charity and glory of Christ. With Oberlin, warm hearted amid the mountain snows of Switzerland. With Felix Neff on the icy Alps: with Owen and Dod-

ridge, Pearce and Fuller, Wesley and Fletcher, Coke and Asbury, humble followers of Christ, doing good in his name, gathering the credentials of their office and their spirit from the renewing power of God.—(*Eddy*) With these principles we find no difficulty in answering the question of Mr. Bolles, “where was your Church before Wesley?” Without asking in turn where was their Church before the Reformation? we answer. It was “where truth, grace and the spirit of God lived and reigned—where the *charter* of the kingdom of heaven was sacred and inviolate. Whether in exiled familes, chased, crowded, suffering amid mountain rocks and eternal snows, or with the saints sighing in silence and despair at the abominations of cruelty and sin, whose remonstrant successors, came forth at last from the bosom of night, that constellation of wonders and toils. These were *the Church*, and to the Church universal the resurrection of life and hope, the joy and triumph of a spiritual christianity. Here was *the Church*, and it can be no where else even now. We look not to Rome, to Canterbury, nor Geneva, but where ‘believers’ meet, rejecting a cold and miserable formalism, in love with truth and God, there is *our Church*, our home, our *rest*. There is the ministry of Christ, vital and valid; the Holy Ghost its sanction and Heaven its hope.”—(*Ibid.*)

Nor does this doctrine as held by us—which rejects the succession of high Churchmen—lead to the only alternative, “that any individual who choose may administer the sacraments and preach the *gospel*;” as we have checks against imposition which will not suffer by a comparison with those of the Protestant E. Church. It is difficult to reconcile such loose reasoning with a critical knowledge of the subject discussed. Any one acquainted with the regulations of our Church, knows that there are various criteria instituted by which a profession of being moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel is tested, and the Church guarded against disturbance from “self-constituted teachers.”

Another reason Mr. B. assigns why his personal succession should be treated with more veneration, is, that it constitutes “the only safeguard against schism and heresies” with which Churches that reject it “are rent.” Schism and heresy are changes which have been rung in the ears of all who claimed and dared to exercise the right of private judgment ever since the establishment of the Roman hierarchy; and have been responded to by all who were disposed to commit their consciences to the safe keeping of a corporation of Prelates. But to one of the puritanic school they are no alarming tones. Says the memorable Mr. John Hales, “*heresy* and *schism*, as they are in common use, are two theological *scarecrows*, which they who uphold a party in religion, use to fright away such, as making inquiry into it, are ready to relinquish and oppose it, if it appear either erroneous or

suspicious." But, what is schism? What is heresy? "Schism," says Dr. Dick, "consists in want of love among the members of the Church, and may exist in full force while there is no visible branch in their external communion. If, in a Church, there are two parties who meet in the same place of worship, and are subject to the same rulers, but, at the same time are actuated by mutual jealousy, and are secretly endeavoring to counteract and undermine each other; in that Church there is a schism. United in their sentiments respecting articles of faith and modes of worship, christians may be divided about matters of inferior moment, as we too often see the peace of congregations disturbed, and hostile parties formed, about the management of their temporal affairs, or the selection of a minister, or some point much more insignificant. The schism in the Church of Corinth originated in the preference of one minister; while one said, 'I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, and a third, I am of Cephas.' In all such cases a schism exists because that *love* is wanting, without which a society of professed christians is not one body, but a number of parts in juxtaposition, or a chaos of discordant elements." Says Mr. Wesley "the indulging any unkind temper toward our fellow christians is the true Scriptural schism." By heresy, as defined by Webster, we understand to be "a fundamental error in religion, or an error of an opinion respecting some fundamental doctrine of religion. In a country where there is an established (national) Church, an opinion is deemed heresy when it differs from that of the Church. In scripture, and primitive usage, heresy meant sect, party, or the doctrine of a sect; as we now use denomination or persuasion, implying no reproach." As to who are heretics, "John Jewell, bishop of Sarum" says, "ye shall find throughout the whole body of the scriptures, that no people were ever so great crakes of the *Church*, as they that were the deadly enemies of the *Church*: nor none were so ready to condemn others of *heresie*, as they that indeed were themselves the greatest *heretikes*." The evils, then, against which Mr. Bolles' succession is to secure the Church, are errors in religion, and uncharitable division within the Church; or it preserves a Church in unity of faith and love. These are important things well worthy of our attention, and hence, will warrant an examination. I do not wish to injure the feelings of our succession brethren by unnecessarily adverting to the schisms and heresies with which they have been and are distracted both in the old and new world, in ancient and in modern times. In as much, however, as they have invited this investigation, I will give the points a brief notice.

Mr. Bolles claims that this personal succession possesses a charm, or vital power, which acts as a safeguard against the evils of heresies and schism. Now this can be ascertained only by

tracing the history of those Churches who claim to possess it. If then, an exhibition of their domestic troubles is afflictive, let them bear in mind that *they*, not *we*, have created this necessity. That the Protestant Episcopal, the Anglican, the Roman and the Greek Churches have the true succession Mr. Bolles will not deny—though each in turn have been excommunicated—hence the range for proof is wide and the history of past centuries will furnish evidence sufficient to prove the value of his safeguard; and the further we sail up this successional stream—the nearer we approach the fountain—the clearer may we expect the evidence of its vitality will appear.

A man must be very ignorant of the past history, and present condition of these successional Churches, not to know, that for these many years and even now they are living in a state of schism—exercising the most deadly hostility—hurling criminations and recriminations against each other. Ignorant, indeed, must be the mind that does not know, there is now open war in the communion of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Churches. Are not the successional papers arrayed against each other as organs to parties now formed in the same communion? Has not Rome always claimed to have this personal succession? Where was this safeguard then when according to their own historian Onuphrius Panvinius, twenty schisms occurred in one Bishopric before the end of the 14th century; some of them continuing for forty years? Where was it when four at the same time claimed to be the same link in this chain, and by cunning, banishment, poison, or murder, it was decided who was the lawful claimant? Where was this vital power, when “the whole Church was divided against itself; Cardinal against Cardinal; Council against Council; Nation against Nation; and faction, poison, murder, war and bloodshed” were the order of the day? What thought the old Reformers of this vital power, when in the homilies of the Anglican Church they say of Rome “AN IDOLATROUS CHURCH, *a foul, filthy old withered harlot, decked with images, AS GREAT PUPPETS FOR OLD FOOLS,*” and that rather than once kneel, or offer up one particle of incense before this image they would and did suffer the most cruel death? When in their Book of Common Prayer they said, “from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us!” And, when the convocation at Dublin in 1615 said, “the Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the Universal Church of Christ, that his *works* and *doctrines* do plainly discover him to be the *man of sin* foretold in Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and abolish with the brightness of his coming.”

The Reformed Church of France says, “Whereas the Bishop of Rome, having erected to himself a monarchy over the Chris-

tian world, doth usurp a dominion over all Churches and pastors; and hath rose to such a height of Pride as to call himself God, will be adored, and all power to be given him in heaven and earth; disposeth of all ecclesiastical things; defines articles of faith; saith the authority of the Scriptures and the interpretation of it to be *from him*; maketh merchandise of souls; dispensemeth with vows and oaths; institutes new worship of God. As also in *civil affairs treads upon the lawful authority of the Magistrates* in giving, taking away, translating of empires, we do believe and assert him to be the *very proper anti-Christ, SON OF PERDITION* foretold in the word of God; the *scarlet harlot* sitting on seven mountains in the great city; which hath obtained a rule over the kings of the earth: and we do expect when the Lord according to his promise and, as he hath begun will destroy him with the spirit of his mouth, and at length abolish with the brightness of his coming."

Fox, the Martyrologist, says, "and to begin, first, with the order and qualities of life, I ask, here, of his Roman *Clergy*, where was this Church of theirs, which now is, in the ancient time of the primitive Church of Rome; with this pomp and pride; with riches and superfluity; with this gloria mundi and name of Cardinals; with this prancing dissoluteness, with this extortion, bribing, buying and selling of spiritual dignities; these annats, reformations, procurations, exactions and other practices for money; this avarice, insatiable ambition, intolerable fleshly filthiness, most detestable barbarousness, and negligence in preaching; promise breaking, faithlessness, poisoning, and supplanting one another with such *schisms* and *divisions*, which never were more seen than in the elections and court of Rome THESE SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS with such extreme cruelty, malice and tyranny, in burning and persecuting their poor brethren to death!"

Nor has this safeguard preserved the Church from heresy. Did it thus preserve the Church in the fourth century, when nearly all the Bishops were Arian denying the Godhead of Christ, and the divinity of the Holy Ghost? Read the words of Bishop Jewell—a witness whom Churchmen will not reject—"Pope Honorius was condemned for a *heretic in two General Councils*. In the Council of Constantinople the words of this condemnation be alledged thus 'we have caused Honorius, the late *Pope of old Rome*, to be *accursed*, for that in *all things* he followeth the mind of Sergius *the heretic* and confirmed his wicked doctrines.' In the very legend of Hilarius it is mentioned that *Pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a Synod holden at Rome against Pope Hildebrand it is written thus, "*Incendio tradidimus Decreta eorum Heretica*'—'we have burnt their heretical decrees.' Pope Sylvester II was made Pope by *necromancy* and in recompense thereof *promised both soul and body unto the devil*. The Council of

Basil condemneth *Pope Eugenius* by these words, ‘we condemn and depose Pope Eugenius, a despiser of the holy Canons; a disturber of the peace and unity of the Church of God; a notorious offender of the whole universal Church; a Simonist, a forsworn man, (perjurum) a man incorrigible; a *schismatic*; a man fallen from the faith and a wilful heretic.’ Now if idolaters, Montanists, Arians, Monothelites, Nestorians, deniers of the immortality, Simonists, sorcerers, maintainers of filthiness, and other obstinate and wilful heretics may err, then—it is easily seen, that the Pope may err, in respect as well of his heresy in faith as of his lewdness of life. Verily the Council of Basil saith, thus, ‘it is reported and read that many Popes have fallen into errors and *heresies*.’ Equally powerless is this safeguard against sin. St. Bernard, says of this successional Church, “its offices of ecclesiastical dignity are turned into filthy lucre and a work of darkness.” And Prideaux, a staunch Churchman, Bishop of Worcester, reckons in one Bishopric “thirty-eight usurping Nimrods; forty *luxurious Sodomites*; forty *Egyptian Magicians*; forty-one *devouring Abaddons*; twenty *incurable Babylonians*”; these are not only in the successional Church, but *vital links* in the great chain of personal succession.

It is not, however, my design here to examine this point which Baronius calls “a knot of conjurors, and poisoners; a crew of devilish rebels, abusing religion to varnish their damnable designs.” Nor to examine this “rock of monsters”; this rope of sand; these vicars of Jesus Christ, on which *the Church* claims to be built; against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. My only object is, to show the power of this safeguard against heresy and schism as illustrated in the history of those Churches who claim to possess it.

The Oxford Tractarians are far in the rear of their coadjutor in Western New York; for they declare in tract Nos. 30, 35, that the Catholic Church during the space of a thousand years fell into grievous errors of faith, doctrine, and practice, “so corrupted the truth of God’s word that they are not to be listened to for a moment.” Now the Catholic Church either did or did not have the succession during this period; if she did not have it, then the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Churches, as her daughters, are destitute of it; for she could not give to them what she did not possess herself. If she had the succession, then, according to the Oxford men, it is not such a safeguard as Mr. Bolles declares it to be. Who that is acquainted with ecclesiastical history has not read of the Pope of Rome and the Patriarch of Constantinople, both successional men, and, in the regular chain, mutually binding each other over to perdition under an eternal anathema—of the Bishops of England, who for acknowledging the supremacy of their King as the head of the Church,

were excommunicated by a successional prelate, and doomed to eternal damnation, for their heresy! Who has not read their meek reply to this act which was supposed to place them under the eternal curse of God? "You are an arch-heretic, anti-Christ, Pope and Devil." Who has not read the following in "Smith's Lectures," and "Stevens' spirit of the Church of Rome." "Even Baronius would not deny, but confess, that in a succession of fifty Popes there was not a pious man. John XXII, was a heretic, and denied the immortality of the soul. John XXIII, Gregory XII, and Benedict XIII, were all Popes and infallible heads of the Church at the same time, and the Council of Constance cashiered the whole of them as illegitimate. The council of Basil convicted Pope Eugenius of schism and heresy. Pope Marcellinus actually sacrificed to idols. Pope Liberius was an Arian and subscribed to that creed. Anastasius was excommunicated as a heretic by his own clergy. (Three names in Mr. Bolles' succession.) Sylvester II. sacrificed to the devil. Formosus was promoted to the chair through perjury. Sergius III. caused his predecessor's body to be dug out of the grave, its head cut off, and then flung into the Tiber. Boniface deposed, imprisoned, and then plucked out the eyes of his predecessor. In a word, many of the Popes have been Atheists, rebels, murderers, conjurors, adulterers, and Sodomites. Papal Rome has far exceeded in crime her Pagan predecessor. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the Popes, though always assuming a new name yet never take the name of Peter! It is a curious fact that they always shun it! Those who have received that name at the font have always changed it when they reached the chair. The fear that the name of Peter would too plainly show their apostacy from the Apostle Peter's virtues; and men would be apt to exclaim, 'how unlike is Peter the Pope to Peter the Apostle!' Where was the succession preservative when the Novatians, Marcionites, Manicheans, Donatists, and Arians, of the fourth and fifth century flourished? Was not Nestorius; a Syrian Bishop of Constantinople, a disciple of the celebrated Theodore of Mopsuestia, a man remarkable for learning and eloquence, was he not in this personal succession? And yet at a Council at Alexandria in A. D. 430, twelve anathemas were hurled at his head and he retorted the same charges upon his orthodox adversaries! Were not Cyril, and John, Bishops of Antioch in this century, in the personal succession; the famous Eutyches, and Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria; Flavianus, patronized by Leo the great; Peter surnamed Fullo; and Mongus John, Bishop of Jerusalem, and the patron of Pelagius? And, by the by, was the Church under the protection of this safeguard? When at the Council of Diospolis it acquitted Pelagius of all error, or when by the Ephesian Council he was condemned for the same sentiments as.

a heretic? When Augustin the predestinarian, and a host of others in the successional Church have had their doctrines and opinions approved as orthodox, or when by the same Church they have been condemned as heterodox? Such is the life-guard of personal succession to preserve from *schism* and *heresy*.

As Mr. B. is so great a believer of what the Oxford men say, it may not be amiss to quote their opinion as to its influence in the Church of England. In tract No. 49 we have the following: "the appointment of all our bishops, and in much the greater number of instances of those who are to undertake the cure of souls, is vested in the hands of individuals irresponsible and unpledged to any opinions or any conduct; laymen, good or bad, as it may happen, orthodox or heretic, faithful or infidel. The bishops *every one of them*, are as a matter of fact, appointed by the prime minister for the time being, who since the repeal of the test act may be an avowed Socinian or even Atheist. A very large proportion of other Church benefices, carrying with them the cure of souls, are likewise in the hands of the prime minister or of the Lord Chancellor and other lay patrons, who, like him, may be of any or no religion. As to the election of bishops, the dean, and chapter, with whom it still formally rests, have only twelve days given them to inquire into the character of the person nominated, *who may be an entire stranger to every one of them or known through report most unfavorably*. If they fail to elect in this time, election becomes unnecessary, and the crown presents without it. And now the Dean and Chapter have eight days given them, and the Archbishop twenty, for reflection. If within these periods the former fails to go through the form of election, and the latter to consecrate, both parties subject themselves to the pains and penalties of a *premunire*, that is, all their goods ecclesiastical and personal are liable to confiscation, and themselves to imprisonment till such time as they submit." This is a striking comment upon the preservative power of this personal succession. The reader should bear in mind that this succession scheme makes all these heretics, infidels, atheists, by virtue of their consecration, bona fide ministers of Jesus Christ. To display the motive by which the prime minister is sometimes influenced in selecting bishops, &c., it is only necessary to quote the bishop of Landaff. "In this manner did I acquire a bishopric. But I have no great reason to be proud of the promotion, for I think I owed it not to any regard which he who gave it me had to the zeal and industry with which I had for many years discharged the functions and fulfilled the duties of an academic life; but to the opinion, which from my Sermon, he had erroneously entertained, *that I was a warm, and might become, a useful partisan*. Lord Shelburne, indeed, had expressed to the duke of Grafton his expectation that I would occasionally *write a*

pamphlet for their administration, &c. I had written in support of the principles of the Revolution, &c. I had taken part with the people in their petitions against the influence of the crown, &c. But all this was done from my own sense of things and without the least view of pleasing any party. *I did, however, happen to please a political party, and THEY made me a bishop.*" This is honest, but how does it make the vital power of personal succession to drive away heresy from the Church, appear. Mark, it was a political party, for political purposes, that made this bishop!

Has it preserved unity of faith? Look at Rome; she claims, indeed, unity of faith as proof of her Apostolical character, but it is a vain pretence; "Popes have contradicted Popes, General Councils have contradicted General Councils, Fathers have contradicted Fathers, and their most learned Doctors have contradicted each other." She claims, indeed, perfect infallibility, and hence demands submission to her teachings upon pain of damnation; but where does it reside? This is a point which Rome has not settled. One says in the Pope; another in the General Council; a third in both of them united; but how vain the boast, that it exists any where. Says Pope Gregory, "Whosoever claims the universal episcopate is the forerunner of anti-christ," but has not his successors claimed this very universal episcopate? Did not the Council held at Constantinople in 754 order the images to be removed from the Churches and prohibited their worship? And yet, the second Council of Nice in 787, ordered the images to be restored, re-established their worship, and anathematized all who had been instrumental in removing this idolatry. It is unnecessary to enlarge here as with these and similar facts to almost any amount, the student in ecclesiastical history must be familiar. And if it has not produced unity of faith in Rome, where by canon law one is allowed to think for all, what may we expect to find in the Church of England? Some idea of the uniformity of sentiment that prevails among even the highest dignitaries of the Anglican Church, may be gathered by reading the Westminster Review for July 1842. Their various expositions of their 17th article, furnish a most striking illustration of the power of this successional safeguard to preserve the Church in unity, and peace. And as to the Protestant E. Church, any one who has read their periodicals for the last twelve months, would not think there was much unity. In the Banner of the Cross, a paper very highly recommended by that Church in this community, and said by one of the papers of this village to be "one of the most sterling religious publications we see"—sterling, because of its opposition to, its open war with, and its bitter sayings against the Methodists. One of the correspondents of this paper after deplored the ruinous party contests going on

among themselves in which he says, “parties are dealing blows thick and heavy upon, alas, the Church and her faithful sons!” “With infinitely more gallantry than sense, her knight militant has rushed, pell mell, into the thickest of the fight.” He thus concludes his article:—“One party has learned to speak with as much contempt of the authority of the Church, and of the value of primitive christianity as the wildest of our dissenting brethren could desire; while a leading journal of the Church on the other side, has come openly to maintain the Romish tenet of the infallibility of the Church.” Surely, “a Church in which are found Unitarians, Arians, and Socinians, Calvinists and Arminians, Successionists and Anti-successionists, high Churchmen and low Churchmen, all subscribing the same articles and ministering at the same altars, has not much to boast of upon the subject of unity.

These references must suffice. We have seen that personal succession does not secure Churches who claim to possess it, from heresy and schism; and even in the communion of St. James there are Oxford tract-men and anti-Oxford tract-men; successional and anti-successional; high and low Church-men, Calvinists and anti-Calvinists; and if I am not misinformed, Universalism, to say nothing of other “isms,” is no bar in Batavia to admission into the ranks of succession. What a glorious union this! If, then, this is the only safeguard against schism and heresy, we might as well have none, for it is incompetent, and we are not the losers by being out of Mr. Bolles succession. So far from this being a safeguard, we affirm, and in this the history of the Church will sustain us, that it is the promoter of schism, and must ever be so, except in such places where the decision of the prelates is admitted by all to be infallible. This teaching, as articles of faith, the traditions of the Fathers; this imposing ceremony of human origin as necessary to salvation; elevating them above purity of heart and life, yea, making these latter as nothing in what constitutes a true Church or true ministry—is, and ever has, as Chillingworth the great defender of Protestantism says, “the only foundation of all the schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal, the common incendiary of christendom, and to which, (as I said before,) tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Jesus Christ.”—(*Vide also Archbishop Whately’s “Kingdom of Christ,” p. 188.*)

The revival of this doctrine, according to the Recorder, a Protestant Episcopal paper, has already produced scriptural schism in that Church, and portends separation. Scarcely a number of any one of their periodicals but we meet with the charge of heresy in being too Protestant, and the charge of heresy back again in being too Roman. The history of the Church is full of schisms, persecutions, oppression, excommunications, and anathemas which

it has effected against the most pious of its members. The most violent controversies that have agitated the Church from the 4th century to the present time, are those which have arisen among these Apostolical successors about the extent of prelatical domination. We deny not but that there is a want of union among Churches out of this personal succession, but what we wish to show is, that the safeguard Mr. Bolles recommends, so far from saving us from these evils, would rather bring an augmentation of them. He, therefore, seeks to sustain and recommend his scheme not only by *assumed*, but *false* premises. There is another and better remedy always found in a greater or less degree, in the *true* succession. In all Churches where there is the succession of the faith and purity of the gospel, there love abounds, non-essentials are not magnified, but tolerated, experimental piety and practical godliness are enforced as essential to union with Christ here and hereafter. There may be excitement in those Churches, but in most instances it can be traced to one of two causes, either a zealous performance of christian duties, or a rigid administration of gospel discipline; from both of which the personal prelatical successionist is secured; and if this is a blessing, he is welcome to an exclusive enjoyment of it.

What renders this vain boast of the power of a personal succession still more preposterous is, that its friends and advocates are not agreed as to what or where it is. To say nothing about the fact, that the strongest men in those communions where it is said to exist, have, again and again, rejected the dogma, I would only observe, that these communions who claim the indelible imprint, unwilling that any but themselves should enjoy this great inheritance, have in turn ejected each other. Do you inquire at Rome if this safeguard can be found at St. James, or in the Protestant Episcopal Church? The Vatican thunders no! Is it in the Anglican Church? Long ago the scarlet beast of the seven hills anathematized, excommunicated, and consigned her over to "pains and penalties," declaring she was no Church at all! Shall we find it in the Greek Church? She also has received from the Roman Pontiff the same doom of the Church of England. Shall we find it at Rome? The Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church, have called her "the man of sin"—"anti-Christ and devil"—and the eastern Church, centuries since, hurled at Peter's successor the bull of excommunication! Where shall we find it, when its pretended holders disagree about its location, when reason, common sense, history, all declare it has no real existence? It is a figment of the imagination that can be found only in the fanciful vagaries of these prelatical monopolizers of God's covenant mercies, and had its origin in the days of priestly arrogance, of lordly assumption, and spiritual domination; and it will be in time for the Rector to recommend

this specific, when these lords of God's heritage shall have defined its character and agreed upon its location. Had the purity of the Church from heresy been left to these "self-styled Apostolic Bishops" we have reason to believe that truth ere this would have been driven out of the Church. These successional men have not been the instruments by which truth has been preserved. Who, but these overlaid the tables of the law with the dust of rabbinical lore until its original characters could not be perceived? Who, but these elevated the traditions of the elders above the word of God, and made his law of none effect? And who resisted this flood of error; removed this dust; retraced these characters, and presented the word of God as the rule and sufficient rule both of faith and practice? Why the Nazarene, and fishermen of Galilee! God watches over his truth with more than vestal care, and when man corrupts he raises up his own instruments by which he confounds the wisdom of the wordly wise, and teaches man, that he holds the keys to the ministry in his own hands; and all whom he has not admitted, by whomsoever consecrated, are impostors, wolves in sheep clothing. Thus has it ever been in every succeeding age of the Church, when truth has been perverted and experimental piety depreciated, he has raised up reformers. Such were "the poor men of Lyons—the Huguenots in France—the Lollards in England—Luther, the monk in Germany—the Wesleys at Oxford," and a host of others. Let us bless God for these his ministers, by whom truth has been proclaimed and transmitted from age to age! Let us pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers into his vineyard; men sent by heaven and by heaven owned, full of faith and the Holy Ghost! Men who have drank at the well of salvation; graduated at the feet of Jesus Christ; linguists read in the language of a *spiritual* christianity; Missionaries who count not their lives dear so that they may win souls to Christ; who talk "the thoughts that breathe and the words that burn"; who strip a formal religion of its delusive grandeur and expose the gloomy sepulchre full of dead men's bones; "who worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh"; the chief characteristics of whose religion are simplicity, and spirituality. May these be multiplied more and more till the cross of Christ be triumphantly planted on every shore, till—

"Heaven's last thunder shakes this world below."

CHAP. XII.

Mr. Bolles' charges continued—I had ridiculed his doctrine of Succession—a doctrine which he affirms I should respect, because, third, it has in its favor the universal suffrage of the Church. Fourth, it preserves the Church against the assaults of "self-constituted teachers." Fifth, "it releases the Laity from doubt whether they really have the Sacraments or not."

Another reason assigned by Mr. Bolles why his doctrine of personal prelatical succession should be treated with reverence, is, that "it has been maintained by the soundest divines of almost every persuasion." This appeal to human authority is the ultima ratio, the Alpha and Omega of all the proof adduced by high Churchmen. The scriptures to them, in establishing their claim, is as an arid waste; to present a "thus saith the Lord" would be a task like that of the Israelites "making brick without straw." Should the universal suffrage of the Church be made out in his favor, it would be merely an *argumentum verecundiam* —an attempt to overawe by the weight of authority, without entering into the merits of the case—an argument addressed to *modesty*—that makes its appeal to *decency*, which proceeds upon the assumption that error can never become so prevalent as to hold the balance of power—an assumption at war with the history of every age and every land. But I am far from admitting that such a case can be made out; so far from it, I think I shall be able to show that it has been treated with disrespect by many able divines of his own persuasion, and by some who for "soundness" will rank with the successionists of this day; some who stand very high in authority with the Church. I will quote the opinions of a few.

GREGORY NAZIENZEN! "This succession of *piety* ought to be esteemed the *true* succession. For he who maintains the same doctrine of faith is partner in the same chair, but he who defends a contrary doctrine ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an *adversary* to it. This man indeed may have a *nominal* succession, but the other has *the very thing itself*—THE SUCCESSION IN DEED AND IN TRUTH." And he proceeds to show, that the former succession is "adulterated and spurious," is "sickness," "darkness," "storm," and "madness," which endeth with "tyranny upon piety itself."

MELANCTHON! "The Church is *not bound* to an ordinary suc-

CESSION as they call it, of Bishops, *but to the GOSPEL*. When *Bishops do not teach the TRUTH*, an ordinary *SUCCESSION* avails nothing to the Church; they ought of necessity to be forsaken."

PETER MARTYR! "It is a most trifling thing which they" (the Papists) "object against us" (the Reformers) "that we want the right *succeſſion*. It is quite enough for us that we have *succeeded* to the FAITH which the Apostles taught, and which was maintained by the holy fathers in the best ages of the Church."

ZANCHIUS! "For we know that as on the one hand where *true doctrine ALONE*, *without* a continued succession of bishops from the beginning, can be shown to exist, there is a true Church, and a true and legitimate ministry; so on the other hand, where *personal succession alone is boasted of*, the purity of true christian doctrine having departed, there is no legitimate ministry, seeing that both the Church and the ministry of the Church are *bound NOT to persons*, but to the *word of God*."

BRADFORD the MARTYR! "*You will not find in all the scriptures this, your essential point of the succession of bishops.*" "If Christ or his Apostles being here on earth, had been required by the prelates of the Church, then, to have made a demonstration of that Church by succession of *such high priests* as had approved the doctrines which he taught, I think that Christ would have done as I do, that is, (he would) have alledged that which up-holdeth the Church, even the *VERITY*, the *word of God*, taught and believed, *not by the high priests* which of long time had persecuted it, but by the prophets and other good simple men, *which perchance, were counted for heretics of the Church*, which Church was *not tied to succession, but to the word of God.*"

BISHOP JEWEL! "The grace of God is promised to pious souls and to those who fear God, and is *not affixed to bishop's chairs and (personal) succession*," "for that ye tell so many fair tales about Peter's succession, we demand of you wherein the Pope succeedeth Peter? You answer, he succeeded him in his chair, as if Peter had been some time installed in Rome, and had solemnly sat all day with his triple crown in his *pontificalibus* and in a chair of gold. And thus *having lost* both RELIGION and DOCTRINE, ye think it sufficient at last, to hold by the CHAIR, as if a soldier that had lost his sword would play the man with his scabbard. But so Caiphas succeeded Aaron; so wicked Manasses succeeded David; so *may ANTICHRIST* easily sit in PETER'S CHAIR."

WHITAKER! "The Fathers did *not* use this argument of personal succession as a firm and solid argument of *itself*, but as a kind of illustration of their main argument." "The naked succession of persons is like *a dead carcuse without the soul*."

FIELD! "Thus still we see, that *truth of doctrine* is a necessary note, whereby the Church must be known and discerned, and not ministry or succession or any thing else without it."

WHITE! "The succession required to make a Church Apostol-like must be defined by the *doctrine* and not by the *place* or persons. *Wheresoever the true faith, contained in the scriptures, is professed and embraced there is the whole and full nature of an Apostol-like Church.* FOR THE EXTERNAL SUCCESSION WE CARE NOT."

FRANCIS WHITE, BISHOP OF ELY! "The true visible Church is named Apostolical, not because of local and personal succession of Bishops (only or principally) but because it retaineth the *faith* and *doctrine* of the Apostles. Personal or local succession only and in itself maketh not the Church Apostolical; because *hirelings* and *wolves* may lineally succeed lawful and orthodox priests."

STILLINGFLEET! "Come we, therefore, to Rome and here the succession is as *muddy* as the Tiber itself. Then let succession know its place and learn to vail bonnet to the scriptures. The succession so much pleaded by the writers of the primitive church was *not a succession of persons in Apostolical power*, but a succession in Apostolical doctrine."

CALVIN! His testimony must have influence with Protestant Episcopalian, for in accordance with their 17th article they must admit him to be a "sound minister," and with the Bishop of Michigan he is a great favorite. Calvin says, "we have pretty opponents to deal with, who, when they are clearly convicted of corrupting the doctrines and worship of Christianity, then take shelter under the pretence that no molestation ought to be offered to the *successors* of the Apostles. Now, this question of being *successors* of the Apostles must be decided by an examination of the *doctrine* maintained. To this examination confident of the goodness of our cause we cheerfully appeal. Let them not reply, that they have a right to *assunie* that their doctrine is Apostolic for *this is begging the question*. What! shall they who have all things contrary to the Apostles prove they are their true successors solely by the continuance of time? As well might a murderer having slain the master of the house and taken possession of the same, maintain that he was the lawful heir. The Papedom, indeed, differs more from that government which the Apostles established than the most cruel and bloody tyranny ever differed from the best constituted government for the establishment of civil liberty. Who would tolerate the tyrant that having murdered the rightful sovereign only gloried in the usurpation of his name? No less is *their* impudence, who having ruined that government which Christ commanded and the Apostles established make a *pretence of succession* for the support of their tyranny. For, suppose that such *an unbroken line* as they pretend really existed, yet if their Apostolship had perished, and it

necessarily did by their corruption of Gods worship, by their destruction of the offices of Christ, by the extinction of the light of doctrine among them, and the pollution of the sacrament, what then becomes of *their* succession? Except, indeed, as an heir succeeds to the dead, so they, true piety being extinct among them, succeed to domination. But seeing they have changed entirely the government of the Church, the *chasm* between them and the Apostles is so vast as to exclude any communication of right from the one to the other. And to conclude the point in one word, I **DENY THE SUCCESSION SCHEME AS A THING UTTERLY WITHOUT FOUNDATION.**”

JOHN WESLEY! He also is a witness that will not be rejected, for although formerly he was denounced as a heretic, schismatic, and every opprobrious epithet given him which the English language could supply, yet in the war now made upon the Methodists he is esteemed very highly for his orthodoxy, and even the Rector, though he thinks he was a little out of canonical order when he ordained Dr. Coke and sanctioned the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, yet as he was never called to an account for his irregularity, I suppose, he thinks it would ill become him at this late hour to try, and expel him; and hence he concluded that he was a good and true—Church of England man. Hear Mr. Wesley, “I deny that the Romish Bishops came down by *uninterrupted succession* from the Apostles. I never could see it proved; and I am persuaded I never shall. But unless this is proved your own pastors on your principles are no pastors at all.” “The figment of the uninterrupted succession he openly said, ‘he knew to be *a fable*, which never had been nor could be proved.’”

GEORGE LAWSON, one of the ablest theologians in the reign of Charles II. after most fully refuting the high Church hypothesis says, “the *succession of persons* is so uncertain, that whosoever shall make either the being of a Church, or the ministry, or the power of the sacraments, depend upon it, shall so offend Christ’s little ones, and be guilty of such a scandal, as ‘it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea.’ The power of saving men’s souls depends not upon succession of persons, according to human institutions but upon the Apostolical doctrine, accompanied by the divine spirit.” He proceeds to show that the conversion, comfort and salvation of souls was “a more manifest divine confirmation of a ministry than any personal succession.” These are a few specimens from a class of men against whom the charge of “unsoundness” from the Rector of St. James comes with an ill grace, and for which he will secure but little honor from the Prelates of his own church. These quotations show not only, that there are “sound divines”

who have but little respect for his personal succession, but also in what the *true* succession consists—a succession of *truth* and *purity*.

Another reason presented by Mr. Bolles why the doctrine of his succession should be respected, is, that it “is the only safeguard of the Church against the assaults of self-constituted teachers.” And on page 47 it is more than intimated that an “inward feeling” or impulse is the *only* test of ministerial qualifications in those Churches who reject this doctrine of a personal succession. What I understand Mr. B. to mean, is, that this safeguard preserves them from the evil of being disturbed by the labors of those who may feel it their duty to preach the Gospel, but who have not complied with the rules which this dogma imposes. In other words, that no one, in their Church, can be a minister without first conforming to certain regulations which have obtained among them; but in Churches out of this succession, an inward feeling or impulse is the only test; hence any one upon the profession of this emotion is *ipso facto* received in these Churches as a true minister. That this is what Mr. B. intended to say no one can doubt who reads p.p. 45, 6 and 7 of his work. And yet, this construction of his language makes it such a gross misrepresentation of the regulation of those Churches, not Episcopal in his sense, that I scarcely know how to account for it. Can it be true that the Rector of St. James is so ignorant of the usages of the large and respectable Christian Churches, with which he is surrounded, that he really believes this inward feeling to be the *only* test of ministerial qualification? If it be so, it would, certainly, be well for him either to abide awhile at Jerico for more maturity in knowledge or seek a better counsellor than his “intelligent farmer,” who, he says, has paid much attention “to the internal regulations” of other Churches, before he joins issue with his neighbors. I cannot think however, he is so unacquainted with our rules and customs; and yet this would be the most charitable construction, for if he knows better and he says, he “is *old* enough to know better,” then it must be a *designed* misrepresentation. The only ground on which extreme obtuseness of intellect or moral obliquity can be avoided is to attribute it to that looseness and carelessness of expression which abounds not only in the work I am now reviewing, but in most of the productions of high Church writers. It seems to be a common effect of these exclusive notions to engender indifference to a proper discrimination or accurate description of those who are regarded by them as mere “human organizations.” Their exposure by such a course to such charges, I should think ought to be “a lesson of caution.”

It may not be improper here to inquire what is the safeguard of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by which she, more than

other Churches, is secured against the labors of these “self-constituted teachers”? Her Clergy must first profess to believe they are moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon themselves the office of the ministry. For, I read in their Book of Common Prayer the following question and answer. To every candidate the Bishop proposes this question—“Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration, to serve God, for the promoting of his glory and the edifying of his people”? To which every candidate must reply, “I trust so.” Let Mr. B. be cautious how he ridicules this “inward feeling”—this call from God to preach the Gospel, for he himself has responded in the affirmative to this question, “Do you think you are *inwardly* moved by the Holy Ghost,” &c. For any then to take the office of a minister in his Church without being fully persuaded that God has called him by an “inward feeling” to this work, is to be inducted into that office with a lie in his mouth. This, most certainly, should be a “lesson of caution” to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church against speaking disrespectfully, contemptuously, or triflingly, of this inward feeling. This shows the piety of its founders. This is the only safeguard against a worldly ministry, and permitting it to become a dead letter is one of the evils that exist in the Church of England; and if this sneer of Mr. B.’s at “a divine call” is a fair expression of the sentiments of the Clergy of his Church, it would show not only that they were in a fallen condition, but that their exhortations to us “not to use words in our ordination that we did not believe,” were more needed in their own communion. And yet when we couple this cant at a divine call with the doctrines of the tracts he has circulated here, that Baptism is union with Christ, and the Lord’s Supper, the life giving bread from heaven, in which the piety of Methodists is most contemptuously spoken of, as a religion of *feeling*; it would seem that he had not now a very high opinion of that “inward feeling” by which he once declared to his Bishop he was moved to enter the ministry. This then is one of the safeguards of the Protestant E. Church against “self-constituted teachers”—but have not all other Churches the same?

In our Church in addition to the same question and answer above noticed I find the following in Section II. of our Book of Discipline: “Ques. How shall we *try* those who profess to be moved by the Holy Ghost to preach? Ans. Let the following questions be asked, viz. Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire nothing but God? And are they holy in all manner of conversation? Have they gifts as well as grace for the work? Have they in some tolerable degree a clear sound understanding, a right judgment in the things of God, a just conception of salva-

tion by faith? And has God given them any degree of utterance? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly? Have they fruit? Are any truly convicted of sin and converted to God by their preaching? As long as these three marks concur in any one we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as sufficient proof that he is moved by the Holy Ghost." The three marks are *intellectual ability*; *moral purity*; and *usefulness*; accompanied with an avowal upon the part of the candidate that he believes he is called to this work by the Great Head of the Church. And that the persons who act upon his case, may do so understandingly, the candidate for orders preaches for some years prior to ordination under a License subject to an annual renewal. It will be seen from these statements that this the most important part in the safeguard is possessed by us, and no one acquainted with Methodism will affirm that in our Church it is a "*dead letter*." We regard it as the sine qua non without which, however numerous or canonical our ordinations, we have no valid ministry. We agree with Dr. Clarke, who says, "how idle and vain is a boasted succession from the Apostles, while ignorance, intolerance, pride, and vain glory prove that these very persons have no commission from Heaven! Endless cases may occur where man, sends, and yet God will not sanction. And that man has no right to administer the sacraments of the Church of Christ whom God has not sent, though the whole assembly of the Apostles had laid their hands on him. God never sent, and never will send, to convert others, a man who is not converted himself. He will never send him to teach meekness, gentleness and long suffering, who is proud, overbearing, intolerant, and impatient. He in whom the spirit of Christ does not dwell, never had a commission to preach the Gospel; he may boast of his human authority, but God will laugh him to scorn."

Does the Protestant E. Church require her candidates for the ministry to pass through certain examinations before appointed tribunals, ere they can be admitted to orders; and do not other Churches require the same? Have not other Churches ordeals which they have instituted as numerous and as well calculated to detect alloy by which the intellectual and moral qualifications of their Licentiates are tested? And the candidates having passed these tribunals are they ordained by an order of ministers whom that Church recognize as proper administrators? And do not other churches the same? Is there not with them a formal recognition and public acknowledgment of suitable qualifications by virtue of which there is a consecration—a setting apart to the work of the ministry? Where, then, is to be found and in what consists the superiority of their safeguard; and where the truth that an "*inward feeling*" is the only test?

But who are these "*self-constituted teachers*"? Are they those

who feeling that they are moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, proceed without any formal certificate from any Church. And what great harm have they done? Have they been the cause of promoting sin, of preventing the conversion of souls, producing worldly mindedness? Is there not another class of "self-constituted teachers"? Those whom man has called and ordained but whom God never appointed; wicked men ridiculing spiritual christianity; trifling with the inward calling of the Holy Ghost! It strikes me, that such a class would be emphatically "self-constituted teachers." Who will deny that such a class does exist, and who that is acquainted with the history of prelatical domination, will deny that a class of this character, not small in its dimensions, may be found along the succession line? And if the self-constituted teacher is to be held up as an evil to be deprecated, if we are to have one of the classes named, which of the two is preferable, those whom God or man has sent? With the Psalmist I would say "let me fall into the hands of God rather than man."

Perhaps it will be claimed by Mr. Bolles that those are "self-constituted" who have not been ordained by a triple consecrated Prelate. This however is denied and will not be yielded without "good and sufficient" proof. But even in that case what have they gained? Who was it that spread scriptural holiness through England; waked up the dormant energies of that national church; brought thousands under God to a knowledge of sins forgiven; who, though before had a nominal existence in the Church were nevertheless dead in trespasses and sins? "Self-constituted teachers"—Mr. Wesley's lay helpers! Who were the disciples that fled from the persecution at Jerusalem, and went every where preaching the Gospel and establishing Churches? "Self-constituted teachers"! Who were the Puritan fathers, that kindled the fires of devotion upon the rock of Plymouth; fires that shot their beams far and wide into the moral gloom that rested as a thick cloud upon the western continent? "Self-constituted teachers"! Who were Luther, Knox, Calvin, Watts, Dodridge, Edwards, Davies, Nesbitt, Hall, Chalmers, Whitfield, Asbury, McKendre, Emory, Fisk, and a host of others, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, who have given abundant evidence that they were called of God, having seals to their ministry; under whom innumerable souls have been converted, and sinners saved? Nevertheless they were according to Mr. Bolles "self-constituted teacher," "impostors," "knaves and robbers; impudent intruders who have not entered into the fold by the only door, and whose baptisms and other administration of ordinances are sacriligious." And who are the regular constituted teachers which the safeguard of a personal succession secures? All who have been consecrated by a triple ordained

Prelate? All such, whatever may be their moral and private character, be they never so ignorant, wicked, profligate, corrupt, odious, abominable, infamous, or base depraved wretches, they are, nevertheless, legitimate successors of the Apostles—true ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ—all their acts valid, acknowledged, and ratified in heaven; and what is the profit? Would it be a blessing think ye if the world was rid of the former class to give place to the latter? Has the doctrine of the divine right of Kings been promotive of moral piety or of general intelligence? Neither has that of a personal succession! It has been a curse instead of a blessing; it is the forerunner of anti-Christ, and as in Rome, it endeth in spiritual arrogance, domination, inquisitorial and purgatorial fires; in papal indulgencies; in making man God; and excluding the Deity from the christian religion! What is the profit? Who were the pioneers of Gospel truth in our land? Who traversed this region when a wilderness, passing their nights in huts rudely constructed of logs, covered with clapboards, floored with puncheons, living on wild meat, corn-cake and spice-wood tea—travelling on horse-back over hill and vale, fording rivers, climbing mountains, passing amid wild deers, screeching owls and shrieking panthers; using a corner of the broad chimney or the saddle on the back of their horse as their study; the Bible, Discipline and Hymn Book for their library, the log school-house, the log cabin, or the forest as the place of worship, and preached the Gospel to our fathers, and caused this wilderness to bud and blossom as the rose; and brought these early settlers to know the power of saving grace? “Self-constituted teachers”! The Lord grant us more of this stamp; men full of faith and the Holy Ghost; men who count not their lives dear so that they may win souls to Christ; men in God’s succession, whom he thrusts out into his vineyard. What is the profit? The only ground of preference for his safeguard against “self-constituted teachers” must be either in its practical effects or in its being a divine requirement. In regard to the former we shall lose nothing by a comparison, and as to the latter, if God has required that all teachers of the Gospel shall be ordained by one who can trace his pedigree through an unbroken chain of triple consecrations up to the Apostles, before they are prepared to preach it, then, indeed presuming to preach without it would be the sin of Korah, and hence, as we are charged with this sin it becomes a question of interest, whether God has thus commanded—whether this is a restriction that God or man has instituted; a guard of human or divine origin, and we call for proof of the *jus dirimum* of their safeguard.

If then, there is no “thus saith the Lord” for it; if it is only an ecclesiastical arrangement not *de jure divino*, but, *de jure ecclesia*, in the absence of which we have violated no express com-

mand of God; and if in the practical workings of our economy we can advantageously compare the fruits with those of the successionist,—(and “by their fruits ye shall know them,”) if the one in our Church is in harmony with the scriptures, then, whether it would be loss or gain to abandon our present regulations, for any supposed advantage which a fabled succession could give, “I speak as to wise men; judge ye.”

Another excellency in Mr. B.’s doctrine of personal succession, which constitutes it a blessing not to be trifled with, is, its consolatory or quieting power upon the minds of the *laity*. “The Laity,” he says, “are especially concerned in maintaining it, for it, alone, can relieve their minds from doubt as to the question whether they really have the sacraments or not.” This is another evidence how closely Mr. B. follows the Oxford men. They say in tract No. 4, that their Church “*is the only Church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord’s body to give to his people.*” The *laity*, no doubt, will rejoice to learn that after being robbed, by prelacy, of the right of private judgment, they are to receive some comfort from the doctrine of succession; and, as the “*intelligent farmer*,” is destitute of it, where he now is, it would not be a matter of wonder, if he should seek it in the communion at St. James. Perhaps upon examination it will be found not to afford so much comfort as Mr. B. promises. Its foundation may be sand instead of rock.

In this recommendatory feature of successionism there are two items which demand our attention. First, It is here claimed that the reality of the sacraments depend upon the fact that the administrator thereof has received the right by a regular personal succession from the Apostles. This is high Churchism; the doctrine of tracts Nos. 4 & 5; the doctrine of Bishop McCosky: of the late Bishop Hobart; of the Oxford men; of the New-York Churchman; of the Banner of the Cross; and from various intimations I have satisfied myself that it is the belief of the Rector. Here, however, we have it announced in language that cannot be misunderstood; so plain that all who read may understand. Let it be remembered, then, that in opposing the exclusive sentiments of the tracts we are opposing the belief of Mr. B., and this, probably, is the reason why he considered *himself* assailed in my public exposition of *their* errors. Let it be remembered that all Churches *not* Episcopal in his sense, have not the sacraments. Who are these Churches? Why, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, &c., all who have not, through a third order independent of and superior to presbyters, received from the Apostles their ordination. All of these Churches have not the sacraments of Baptism or the Lord’s Supper. This is claimed in the tracts which Mr. B. circulated. Of this we complained; that it was an unprovoked attack upon us; holding us up to

the ridicule of the world; an attempt to prejudice community against us; and when, by the call of my charge, I proceeded to expose, not the unkindness of the act in circulating such matters, for to this I made no allusion, but simply to show the unsoundness of the argument of the tracts, by which its author sought to invalidate our ordinances. For this act I am complained of and published to the world by Mr. B., as having attacked the Protestant E. Church, and a book of nearly 200 pages is issued to defend it. To say nothing of the absurdity of such a defense, to preserve a Church that claims to be founded on a rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail—that claims to have an exclusive right to ministerial orders and sacramental administrations—a right which no moral obliquity, no wickedness can invalidate, no power on earth, in heaven, or hell, can take from them—to say nothing of the folly of the defense, is not the ground on which its necessity is urged, and the complaint made, most extraordinary? Let it be remembered, that Mr. B's published belief is, that in all these sister Churches there are no sacraments—that though water is administered by their Pastor in the name of the Trinity, to persons who give the most satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion, they are nevertheless not baptized. That though the bread and wine are consecrated by holy hands and received with penitence and faith, it is not regarded by Jesus Christ as the Lord's Supper, but sacriligious profanation, the sin of Korah and his company, wilful rebellion against God. Tell me, ye pious Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, &c. who when at the baptismal font ye received the outward sign of an inward washing of the Holy Spirit—when at the table ye received the symbols of Christ's body and blood and felt an inward assurance of your heavenly Father's approbation, were ye then profaning God's holy ordinances? And yet, to convict you of this sin, in these acts, is the object, the avowed object, of the author of those pamphlets with which this community has been flooded, and which Mr. B. here proclaims as containing the doctrines of his belief. When I am deprived of all consciousness—(which the Bishop of Michigan denies to all except the priest)—when I am deprived of all power to reason, of all remembrance of the past—then, and not till then, do I expect to be convinced that all the administrations of these sacraments, in these Churches, are profanations in the sight of God. Let the communicants at St. James, who have been received from other Churches without a re-baptism, think of their position. Under the views thus announced by their Rector they are not baptized, and not being baptized, they are out of the Church: and being out of the Church, they are out of the covenant, and have no promise of God's mercy or favor, no pledge, no assurance of salvation.

Second. The above claim makes the amount of comfort which

this doctrine of personal succession can administer to the communicant, to depend upon the *certainty* with which this line of triple ordination can be traced up to the Apostles. For instance, a candidate for baptism or the Lord's Supper at St. James; as he proceeds to the font or the communion table, the consolation arising from the fact that he is about to receive the true sacraments, depends upon another fact, viz., that he is able to cast his eye along the line of succession from the Rector up to St. Peter, and thus see, beyond a doubt, that every link is sound; that the Rector himself, and all his predecessors, have received a valid Apostolical ordination. If there is any doubt in reference to any one of these links, (for the chain cannot be stronger than the weakest link,) then there is no certainty that they are to receive the sacraments; and so far from producing comfort, it must produce extreme anxiety, whether, indeed, they are obeying Christ or profaning his holy ordinance.

This position of Mr. B. no doubt, is correct according to the test of the successionist, by which he decides upon the validity or invalidity of the sacraments; for if God has made over the right of ordination to a corporation of prelatical bishops, to be transferred by them through a line of the same order—if presbyters ordained by such Bishops, only have the right of administering the sacraments, then, indeed, the question for the laity to resolve, is, has my administrator been thus ordained by one who has thus received the right? Which question, of course, can be answered only by an examination of the whole line. This examination being made, and the result being beyond the reach of doubt, we admit, that the person who believes this, the only and proper test, and has thus proved by this test, to a certainty, the validity of the administrator's orders, may proceed to the font or table with the assurance that he is about to receive the true sacraments, and will derive great consolation in having his mind relieved of all doubts. But we deny both the first and last step in this process, though we claim to have the comfort of certainty, derived through another channel. We deny the test as being scriptural. We deny, that any such ordeal, by which the validity of orders or sacraments is to be decided, was ever, by the command of God, instituted. We deny that it had any existence in the purer days of the Church; and we aver, that it is an ordeal of human origin, which originated in priestly arrogance and pride. On this point, as Mr. B. has offered no proof, but merely assumed it as an admitted fact, (a very convenient method sometimes,) it is not necessary to prove the negative. I will only say, that an express command of God, instituting such a test, has *yet to be produced*. When the Rector has established this test, not by forced or doubtful construction of scripture, but by an express “thus saith the Lord,” then will it be in time for doubts to be awakened

in the minds of communicants in other Churches, touching the validity of their sacraments; and until this is done, we only smile at the cry, "we have Abraham to *our* father," but "ye are publicans and sinners." We deny, furthermore, not only the first, but the last step in this process. We deny, admitting the test to be true and proper, that it is one by which it is possible to establish to a *certainty*, the authenticity of the credentials of Mr. Bolles or any other minister at this day. Hence we claim, that all communicants in Churches, who receive this test, must be filled with doubts and fears in relation to their having the true sacraments or not; that so far from its ministering consolation, it must be in all those Churches the promoter of perturbation and the most distressing anxiety.

This is another of our objections. We have learned and taught, that the christian religion was designed to be a universal and perpetual religion; and its having an adaptation to all places, circumstances, and times, is an evidence of its divinity. This test of Mr. B., destroys its adaptation, and renders it impossible for us to know, to a certainty, at this remote period, whether we have the sacraments or not; and this uncertainty must increase in succeeding years, in proportion as we recede from the Apostles, and the records of the past become less numerous and less authentic. Think you, if God had established this test his providence would not have watched over the archieves of his church, so that all necessary evidence to prove, to a *certainty*, not only the original conveyance, but its regular transmission to the present generation, would now be possessed by the Churches? Do you say the Church has this evidence? We deny that she has; and call for the documents properly authenticated. We go further, and say, that she does not even *profess* to have it; that her ablest defenders do not claim that they can prove, to a *certainty*, that it was either conveyed or transmitted! This, must be a very humiliating admission after such "lordly claims" and proffers of consolation arising from the *certainty* of the thing. Let us look at it for a moment. How many do you suppose in the communion of St. James can trace up this line? How many can show, to a certainty, (for there must be no doubt) that Mr. B. received, according to the high Church hypothesis, a valid ordination—that all who preceded the Bishop that ordained him, had received from regular ordained Bishops a triple consecration, according to canonical order, up to St. Peter or either the Apostles? Can any do it? If not, then must not the communicants there have doubts, whether they have the sacraments or not? Do you think that Mr. B. can do it himself? Let me say, if he can, he will be immortalized—no doubt be rewarded for his services by a bishopric, and have his name inserted among the canonized saints of Rome. He will do what no one in that line, in these

latter days, has done. Is he prepared to show, that through the long line of his ecclesiastical pedigree in every solitary instance, nothing, according to the canons setting forth the essentials of ordination, has invalidated the ordination? Is he prepared to show, that none of his Episcopal sires were under sentence of deposition when ordained?—that the faith and morals of all came up to the standard; to Christ's prescriptions—that their baptisms were not heretical, but Episcopally valid?—that they had not been made bishops, *per saltum*, instead of passing through the two inferior grades, or that any other of the numerous disqualifications, judged by the Church to render ordination invalid, such as infancy, insanity, adultery, murder, lapse of time in persecution, and mutilation or dismemberment of their bodies, like that Origen effected on himself, have not vitiated the succession, poisoned the fountain of Episcopal grace, and left Mr. B. out of the Church of God? This is not trifling, but a subject of sobriety—matters of fact—which have been judged sufficient to invalidate ordination, as may be seen in Palmer and Bingham. And until it can be demonstrated in full detail that this claim to an exclusive right to administer the ordinances, in Batavia, upon Mr. B's own principles, he must excuse me, if I cannot recognise him as invested with any such plenitude of sacerdotal power. Though I may recognize him as a minister of Jesus Christ, possessed of powers in common with the presbyters of the Presbyterian, Baptist and Methodist Churches, yet, I cannot consent, until he thus establishes, to a *certainty*, his exclusive claim, to allow him more than *pare inter pares*—equal among (these) his equals.—(Duffield.)

If Mr. B. cannot thus make out his claim, who in his Church can? I will give you the testimony of some high in authority with Churchmen that it cannot be done. Richard Whately, D. D. Archbishop of Dublin, in his *Kingdom of Christ*, says, “It has been thought, or at least maintained, that the only way of affording complete satisfaction and repose to the scrupulous, and of repressing schism, is to uphold under the title of ‘Church principles,’ the doctrine, that no one is a member of Christ's Church and an heir of the covenanted Gospel promises, who is not under a ministry ordained by Bishops, descended in an unbroken chain from the Apostles.” This is precisely the position of Mr. Bolles, and of the reasons why he proclaims and advocates it, hear then what the Archbishop thinks. “Now, what is the degree of satisfactory assurance that is thus afforded to the scrupulous consciences of the members of an Episcopal Church? If a man consider, as highly *probable*, that the *particular minister* at whose hands he receives the sacred ordinances, is really thus Apostolically descended, *this* is the very utmost point to which he can, with any semblance of reason, attain; and the more he reflects

and inquires, the more cause for hesitation he will find." "There is not a minister in all christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to *certainty* his own spiritual pedigree. The sacramental virtue dependent on the imposition of hands, with a due observance of Apostolical usages, by a Bishop, himself duly consecrated, after having been in like manner baptized into the Church, and ordained Deacon and Priest, this sacramental virtue, if a single link of the chain be faulty, must, on the above principles, be utterly nullified ever after, in respect of all the links that hang on that one. For if a Bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinations are null; and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him; and their ordination of others; (supposing any of the persons ordained by him to attain to the Episcopal office) and so on, without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite and irremediable extent. And who can undertake to pronounce, that during that long period usually designated as the Dark Ages, no such taint ever was introduced? Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle; and that no such miraculous interference existed, we have even historical proof. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and of practice, and gross superstitions, that crept in, during those ages, we find recorded descriptions not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of life, of many of the Clergy, but also of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children—of men officiating who barely knew their letters—of Prelates expelled, and others put in their places, by violence—of illiterate and profligate laymen, and habitual drunkards, admitted to Holy Orders; and in short, of the prevalence of every kind of disorder, and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one, even *moderately* acquainted with history, can feel a *certainty*, or *any approach* to certainty, that, amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form, was, in every instance, strictly adhered to, by men, many of them openly profane and secular, unrestrained by public opinion, through the gross ignorance of the population among which they lived; and that no one not duly consecrated or ordained, was admitted to sacred offices.

"Even in later and more civilized and enlightened times, the *probability* of an irregularity, though very greatly diminished, is yet diminished only, and not absolutely destroyed. Even in the memory of persons living, there existed a Bishop concerning whom there was so much mystery and uncertainty as to, when, where, and by whom, he had been ordained, that *doubts* existed

in the minds of many persons whether he had ever been ordained at all. I do not say that there was good ground for the suspicion; but I speak of the fact, that it did prevail; and that the circumstances of the case were such as to make manifest the *possibility* of such an irregularity occurring under such circumstances.

“Now, let any one proceed on the hypothesis that there are, suppose, but a hundred links connecting any particular minister with the Apostles; and let him even suppose that not one above half of this number pass through such periods as admit of any possible irregularity; and then, placing at the lowest estimate the probability of defectiveness in respect of each of the remaining fifty, taken separately, let him consider what amount of *probability* will result from the *multiplifying* of the whole together. The ultimate consequence must be that any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the gospel-covenant depends on his own minister’s claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this again, on perfect Apostolical succession as above described, must be involved, *in proportion as he reads, and inquires, and reflects, and reasons*, on the subject, in the most *distressing doubt* and perplexity.

“It is no wonder, therefore, that the advocates of this theory studiously disparage reasoning; deprecate all exercise of the mind in reflection; decry appeals to evidence, and lament that even the power of *reading* should be imparted to the people. It is not without cause that they dread and lament ‘an age of too much light,’ and wish to involve religion in ‘a solemn and awful gloom.’ It is not without cause that, having removed the christian’s confidence from a rock, to base it on sand, they forbid all prying curiosity to examine their foundation.” Such is the testimony of an Archbishop; and much more upon the same subject may be found in his masterly work, to which I refer the reader, where he will find principles established by this Prelate which justify the entire proceedings in the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Here we have an Archbishop declaring, that the doctrine of a personal succession, so far from administering consolation to those who rely upon it for the validity of the sacraments must be involved by it in the most *distressing doubt* and *perplexity*. This doubt and perplexity will be increased, in proportion as they *read, inquire, reflect, and reason* upon the subject; for he affirms that “there is not a minister in all christendom, who is able to prove, to a *certainty*, his spiritual pedigree.” This, after all, is not so great a blessing to the Laity. It offers, indeed, consolation to them; but it can be found only in the dark regions of the most profound ignorance. If they will neither *read, reflect, in-*

quire nor reason, no doubt the next generation will be prepared to derive great consolation from the doctrine of Apostolical succession! But, we have more testimony.

Says BISHOP BURNET, "This ransacking of records about a *succession of orders*, though it adds much to the lustre and beauty of the Church, yet is not a thing incumbent on every body, nor indeed, *possible* for *any* to be satisfied about; for a great many ages, all those instruments are lost; so that *how* ordinations were made in the primitive Church, we cannot *certainly* know. it is a piece of history, and very hard to be perfectly known. Therefore it cannot be a fit study for any, much less for one that has not much leisure. The condition of christians were very hard, if private persons must *certainly* know how *all* ministers have been ordained since the Apostle's days; for if they will raise scruples in this matter, it is impossible to satisfy them, unless the authentic registers of all the ages of the Church, could be showed, which is impossible, for though we are satisfied, that all the priests of this age were duly ordained, yet, if we be not as sure, that all who ordained them, had orders rightly given them, and so upward till the days of the Apostles, the *doubt* will still remain. Therefore the pursuing of nice scruples about this, cannot be a thing indispensably necessary; otherwise, all people must be *perplexed* with *endless disquiet* and *doubtings*. But the true touchstone of a Church, must be the purity of her doctrine, and the conformity of her faith with that which Christ and his Apostles taught."

Such is the testimony of a man who has had but few equals, either for talent or influence, in England. For the special benefit of the Rector, I will give another quotation from the same Prelate. He says, that "raising the authority and power of sacred functions, beyond what is founded on clear warrants in scripture, is—the readiest way to give the world such a jealousy of them, and such an aversion to them, as may make them lose the authority that they ought to have, while they pretend to that they have not."

REV. J. E. RIDDLE, "of the Anglo Episcopal Church, in his plea for Episcopacy" has the following language: "Whatever may become of the Apostolic Succession, as a theory, or an institute, it is IMPOSSIBLE, at all events, to PROVE the FACT of SUCH SUCCESSION, or to *trace it down* the stream of time. In this case, the *fact* seems to involve the *doctrine*; and if the FACT BE HOPELESSLY OBSCURE, the DOCTRINE IS IRRECOVERABLY LOST. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PROVE THE PERSONAL SUCCESSION OF MODERN BISHOPS, IN AN UNBROKEN EPISCOPAL LINE, FROM THE APOSTLES OR MEN OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE."

T. BABBINGTON MACAULEY says, "Extreme obscurity overhangs

the history of the middle ages, and the facts, which are discernible through that obscurity, proves, that the Church was exceedingly ill-regulated. We read that Sees of the highest dignity were openly sold; transferred backwards and forward by popular tumult; bestowed sometimes by a profligate woman on her paramour; sometimes by a war-like Baron on his kinsman, a mere stripling. We read of *Bishops* of *ten years old*; of many Popes who were *boys*." "We are at a loss to conceive how any Clergyman can feel *confident* that his orders have come down *correctly*." "It is probable that no Clergyman of the Church of England, can trace up his spiritual genealogy, from Bishop to Bishop, even so far back as the time of the Reformation. There remains fifteen or sixteen hundred years, during which the transmission of his orders is buried in *utter darkness*." Even Chapin the great authority with Mr. B. attempts only to make out a bare "PROBABILITY."

To this testimony, and much more of the same class, I might add a large number of instances in which by a want of conformity to the formula of the high Church dogma, the validity of their orders has been vitiated. Who, for instance, can prove beyond a doubt, that Archbishop Secker, Bishop Butler, and Archbishop Tillotson, were ever Episcopally Baptized; and hence were ever in the Church? Some very good *Episcopalians* believe they were not. This would be a break that would at least disturb the repose of *certainty*. Surely it is, as the learned Chillingworth said, "that of ten thousand *probabilities*, no one should be false; that of ten thousand requisites whereof any one may fail, not one shall be wanting. This to me is extremely *improbable*, and even *cousin-German* to *impossible*. So that the assurance hereof is like a machine composed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is strangely unlikely but some will be out of order, and yet, if any one be so, the whole fabric, of necessity, falls to the ground; and he that shall put them together, and maturely consider all the possible ways of lapsing and nullifying a priesthood in the Church of Rome, will be very inclinable to think, that it is a hundred to one that among a hundred seeming priests there is not one true one; nay that it is not a thing very improbable that among those many *millions* which make up the Romish hierarchy there are not *twenty true*."

What shall we think, now, of the motive held out by Mr. B., to allure persons from other communions, drawn from the consolation arising from the assertion, that at St. James there can be *no doubt* that the true sacraments are administered; the certainty of which arises from the known validity of ordinations from the Rector to St. Peter. Is it not true, that so far from this hypothesis furnishing consolation, by removing doubts, it must, to all *intelligent* persons, be the source of *inexpressible anxiety* and

fear, as to whether he have the sacraments or no? Such is the value of this recommendatory feature of his personal succession.

The sum of the matter is, that, as Mr. B. concedes that the certainty of having the sacraments depends upon the certainty of the personal succession, and as by the showing of their best authority the very highest point at which they can arrive after the most critical investigation is a bare *probability* that they have such a succession, (and some do not admit even this) the legitimate, the inevitable conclusion must be, that it is barely *possible* they really have the sacraments or not at St. James;—that after going to its baptismal font and receiving the sign of the Cross, it is barely *probable* that they have been baptized; that after receiving the bread and wine from the Rector it is barely *probable* that they have received the Lords Supper! To all his communicants, after all his labor and toil to allure them from other communions, by seeking to invalidate their ordinances and promising the consolation arising from the *certainty* of having from him the true sacraments, he is made, by his own published sentiments to say, it is barely *probable* that you now have the sacraments; it is barely *probable* that you are in *the Church*—are united to Christ—have a right to the covenanted mercies of God, and have a hope of heaven. And is it not *probable* that they had the sacraments at the other Churches? Can he prove to a *certainty*, can he *demonstrate*, that their ordinances are invalid? In what then does the superiority of his ministrations consist above those of other clergymen? The argument stands thus:—

The validity of the sacraments depend upon Apostolic succession.

It is only *probable* that the Protestant Episcopal Church has this succession.

Therefore it is only *probable* that their sacraments are valid.

The doctrine may be carried further. The test which Mr. B. has set up, by which he would establish the validity of his sacraments and write “hypocrite,” “impostor,” “spurious,” “Korah and his company,” “rebellion against God,” “rending the body of Jesus Christ,” &c., upon the pulpits and altars of all other Churches, if a true test, would destroy the *certainty* of the true sacraments in any Church. The test says;

The validity of the sacraments depend upon the doctrine of Apostolic Succession,

It is only *probable* that such a succession exists in any Church at the present time,

Therefore, it is only *probable* that there are valid sacraments in any Church.

The tendency of the doctrine, then, is to undermine faith; to weaken a desire for the sacraments, and to secure the regular observance of them only where profound ignorance has shut out the

light of historical evidence. For, such doubt and uncertainty on the one hand—such sin and wickedness on the other—if the sacraments are not genuine, would induce a total neglect of so hazardous and doubtful a duty where minds were capable of reason and reflection. The doctrine in every way it can be viewed is a curse, instead of a blessing. It hath no form, nor comeliness, whereby we should desire it.

This doctrine of succession, says the Rector, *alone*, can relieve the communicant from doubt in this matter whether “he really have the sacraments or not.” If this be true we are in a deplorable condition. A large, and the more pious portion of his own Church, however, reject with contempt this arrogant test of the validity of sacraments. They believe they have them genuine though unable to trace through “all its sinuosities, dislocations, fractures and faults,” the pedigree of their administrator up to the beast of the seven hills. And thus in our Church, discarding all such anti-scriptural standards of ministerial qualifications and sacramental tests, we receive, as the Lord’s Ambassador, those who have given evidence to the Church by their piety, their gifts, and their usefulness, that they are moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel. And coming to the font or table with penitent hearts, with faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, we are blessed in the deed, not by virtue of any sacramental virus imparted by virtue of the hands of the administrator. For we reject, as pure Romanism, any other Priesthood save Jesus Christ our Great High Priest; and claim justification by *faith* in Him. How much the Laity should feel themselves concerned in a doctrine, which secures the quiet of *certainty* only by the price of *perfect ignorance* they must judge! I should think, however, they would feel themselves sufficiently interested to reject it with contempt, and regard the motive thus presented by the Rector as an insult to their intelligence.

CHAP. XIII.

Mr. Bolles' charges concluded—I had ridiculed his doctrine of Succession—a doctrine which he affirms I should respect, because, Sixth, it constitutes one of the strongest arguments in favor of Gospel truth and Christ's veracity.—A few reasons why I cannot esteem very highly Mr. B's successional scheme.

Another and a final recommendatory feature of this *personal* succession from the Apostles, as urged by Mr. Bolles, is, that it “constitutes one of the strongest arguments—a standing miracle, I had almost said—in support of Gospel History and the fulfilment of the Saviour’s promise to the Apostles, ‘Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.’” Personal succession is here recommended, as a matter of “great importance and solemnity,” from the evidence which it furnishes in favor of *Gospel truth* and *Christ’s veracity*. As to the amount of evidence thus adduced, Mr. B. affirms, that it is almost miraculous; claiming for it a place with the strongest testimony we have on these subjects. Let us examine them separately.

Personal succession is claimed to be among the strongest evidences we have in favor of *Gospel truth*. We have prophecy with its fulfilment—a series of the most extraordinary miracles, proved to be genuine by a thousand attending circumstances—the purity of the doctrines taught and the excellency of the precepts given—the language in which they were written, their style, candor, minuteness of detail, constant reference to persons, places, &c.—the purity of the character of Christ—the testimony of the Apostles—the writings of the enemies of the Gospel—the preservation of Gospel history, not by successional men, for they have labored to corrupt it, and had there been none other to care for the sacred word we should have probably, had one with transubstantiation, penance and purgatory, snugly interpolated; but, by the providence of God, the same which has preserved a *people* to serve him in *spirit* and in *truth*, and a ministry of *His* calling to preach his Gospel.

God never made over his word to a corporation of Bishops for preservation. *He* has preserved it in *s spite* of them, and when they would *conceal*, as well, as *corrupt* it, *He* inspired men with that benevolence and zeal, to translate and multiply copies of the sacred text, which impelled them onward in the good work though inquisitorial fires flamed up before them kindled by the

successionist. Succession prove the truth of Gospel history? Never. What should we have or know of Gospel truth, had we depended upon successionists to bring and teach it to us? What, but Papal indulgencies and purgatorial fires? Let us try its strength. We have seen, already, that after the most critical investigation, the highest point that can be reached in proving this succession, is, that of *probability*. That it is *probable* God has preserved it—I should have said man; for by their own showing God has nothing to do with it; having given it into the hands of the “Apostolic Bishops”—admitting the position of Mr. B. to be sound, the most conclusive argument, then, that can be brought to prove the credibility of the New Testament, is, that it is *probable* the facts of Gospel history are true! If I believed such a doctrine as this, I should not wonder that there were Deists in the land. Nor should I expect they would ever renounce their deism by any argument of this kind. But, I thank God, we have a more sure word of testimony; we have arguments good and strong that amount to more than a *probability*, that the scriptures are the word of the Lord. God has set to his word the seal of truth; and they who read it with docile minds, and prayerful hearts, prove it to be the power of God unto salvation. It has, in itself, the seeds of immortality—the evidence of its divinity. Man cannot corrupt or destroy it. It is inimitable and indestructable. It lives, and will live in spite of man or devil. The argument is from Rome; and long since used by Papacy; but never used by a Protestant, until, since the revival of it by high Churchism, founded on a fabled personal succession.

This successional scheme is also stated to be one of the strongest arguments we have in favor of *Christ's veracity!* being the fulfilment of the promise he made to be with his disciples. Mr. B. understands this promise, then, to mean, that the Savior will be with his Church—not to preserve truth and purity—not to carry the word which his minister shall preach to the hearts of those that hear—not to give success to truth; but a promise that he will ~~be~~ with the successionists to preserve a regular chain of Prelatical Bishops! This, I am aware, is the divinity of Oxford. But, let us see to what this construction of the promise will lead. If successionism is the only evidence of the divine presence, then, God is with all who have this succession, and, is not with those who have rejected or neglected to secure it. To say nothing of the fact, that the high Church hypothesis rejects the presence of God in the Church, declaring that God has made over, and transferred all right and title, all power and authority, to a corporation of “Apostolical Bishops,” and left it for them to say, whether it shall be continued or not. Now admitting that God is with all Churches who have this succession, then all Churches who have the succession are true Churches. Let me ask the Rector,

if the Church of Rome has not always had the succession? Then has she always been a true Church. If she has always been a true Church, is it not schism to be out of her pale? By what argument can the Church of England be justified in leaving her communion, and, as Bishop Hobart says, "in setting up opposing altars and rending the body of Christ"? How, can Mr. B. justify the epithets that were applied to her by those Reformers, and is not he living in schism himself, while remaining out of her fold? Has he not an opposing altar to the Romish Priest, who administers the *true* sacraments and delivers from the pains of purgatory? Or, does he take the position of Mr. Palmer and plead prior possession? But before he can argue, with any safety, under this new law in polemics; he must establish the legality of such a claim.

Again, if this is a correct construction of the passage, then God is with *all* in this succession! Trace up this line through all the filth and corruption of the dark ages—through all those monsters in iniquity, whose names are on the succession catalogues; and *who* will blasphemously say, that God was with them? But, if the succession could be preserved through one generation without the presence of God, it might be thus preserved through another, and thus, the existence of the succession proves nothing in favor of the presence of God. This, then, is the only alternative. Either the succession exists without the special presence of God, thereby destroying the Rector's argument, or else, it must be admitted that God is specially present with all those found in the succession. A dilemma not very pleasant to the successionist.

Again, it has already been shown, that the existence of this succession is *problematical*. Hence the highest assurance that God is present with them is *probability*, and this, Mr. B. says, is the strongest evidence we have of the *truth* of the Savior—that he has fulfilled his promise. The argument stands thus.

The strongest evidence we have of the Savior's veracity is the existence of the succession.

It is *probable* the succession exists.

Ergo, it is *probable* that Jesus Christ is a Being of truth!!!

Such a doctrine gravely advocated by a divine of the nineteenth century, may appear strange to a person not initiated into the mysteries of high Churchism.

Again, if we admit this construction of the Savior's promise, then are we called upon to denounce all not in this *fancied* succession, as not having the presence or blessing of God. All those holy and successful ministers of the gospel who are not in this line, are impostors, unblessed of God; and who are these? The greatest revivalists in every age; those who have done the most; suffered the most; accomplished the most in spreading scriptural holiness; in saving men from sin. Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius,

Melancthon, Whitfield, Wesley, Asbury. The tens of thousands pious ministers in other Churches, all like Nadab and Abihu, whom the Lord consumed with fire; like Korah and his company, who “went down into the pit, and the earth close upon them, and they perished from among the congregation”; like King Uzziah, who was smitten of the Lord with leprosy, for approaching with a censer the sacred place? What, though they be able, in pointing to the souls blessed through their instrumentality, to say as Paul did when catechised by the high Churchmen of his day, “are ye not my work in the Lord?—If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet *doubtless* I am to you, for the *seals* of my *Apostleship* (not of a prelatical ordination, for this he never had) are *ye* in the Lord.” Yet being out of the succession, ye are not Christ’s ambassadors! What though ye forsake all and preach the gospel to this people, ye cannot trace your title up the stream of succession “through the Augean stables of papal apostacy!” therefore, go out of these vineyards which ye have fenced, and planted, and tilled, for the Lord is not with you, ye are thieves and robbers!

Can a construction of scripture which involves such absurdities, not to say blasphemies, be the true one. Rather does not the passage mean, as Protestants teach, that God will be with *his* ministers whom he moves by the Holy Ghost to preach his Gospel? That in a *marked* and *special* manner, he will attend their labors, support them by his grace under all their trials, give them success in their work? God has been faithful to his word; he *has been* with *his* ministers, whether in the Church of Rome, of England, the Protestant Episcopal, Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran or Methodist Churches—owning their labors, and giving them seals of their ministry. Think ye, the Rector will make the people believe that God was not with Whitfield and Edwards? With Asbury and McKendree? With the pious men through whose instrumentality this wilderness now buds and blossoms as the rose? When they forget the history of the past, and commit their consciences and their intellects to the keeping of the priest, then, and not till then, will they believe it. Who, in Mr. B’s succession, had a holier standard, lived a more exemplary life—was more successful in bringing souls to Christ—who labored more, endured more, loved more—who gave more evidence of the divine presence and approbation than these? “By their fruits ye shall know them,” is an evangelical test, which comes to us with a “thus saith the Lord;” and this with Protestants who take the scriptures as a sufficient rule both of faith and practice, will be preferred to any or all of papal origin. I have now examined all the reasons assigned by Mr. B., why I should be more cautious in the future how I ridicule his doctrine of personal succession; and the degree of reverence for this doctrine, which

those reasons should inspire. The reader must now judge between us, of the necessity of the rebuke, and the reverence which should be paid to his scheme of succession.

In concluding my remarks upon this point, I will notice a few out of many reasons, why I have no very high regard for the doctrine as now set forth by high Churchmen. My want of high veneration for this prelatical monopoly is founded—

First, On the fact, that there is no express declaration in scripture that such an original conveyance of right and power to a corporation of triple ordained bishops, was ever made. To what part of this original record (the Bible) shall we turn, to find that Jesus Christ has transferred to this body, to have and to hold, for the benefit of his Church, the only and exclusive right to perpetuate the Christian ministry, which shall be effected by laying on of their hands on whomsoever they may see fit?—that he has made over to this corporation, all right and interest, whatsoever, in his earthly heritage, so that the fee simple is now in them, to be perpetuated by those whom they may select as their heirs and assigns to this high patrimony; or, if they see fit by a refusal of appointment, to dissolve the corporation and annihilate the Christian Church?—that they, instead of Jesus Christ, are now “head over the Church?”—that they, instead of Jesus Christ, are, as Bishop Hobart says, Prophets, Priests, and Kings? For such a declaration, I have searched the scriptures and find no authority for it; and until such a conveyance of all those rights claimed can be distinctly traced in the original record, either in express declaration, or by proper exegesis, I shall reject the claim as an unwarranted assumption.

A second fact which has had some influence in diminishing, or, rather in preventing an increase of veneration for this personal succession, is, that the present pretended holders of this treasure cannot, by “good and sufficient evidence,” prove their chain of title. So if it could be shown that an original conveyance of this right had been made to such a corporation, it would avail the present claimants nothing. Indeed, the present holders are in dispute among themselves as to where the true title is, or through what channel it is to be traced. Some say it is in the Eastern, some in the Western Church, and some in neither. The Protestant Episcopal Church sometimes attempt to trace it, by way of the beast of the seven hills, sometimes through the Anglican Church, but fails in all. We would not assert that they have no evidence of their succession; but, as Mr. Bolles says of our Episcopacy, they “have no good and sufficient evidence.” We would not say, that they have no catalogues of incumbents in the Episcopal See, from the Apostles down to the “*Right Reverend Father in God, Willm H. De Lancey, D. D. Bishop of the Diocese of Western New-York.*” But it is one thing to insert

names in tabular form, and another and a very different one to show that each of the individuals named, have in regular succession, lawfully held this patrimony—whether each conveyance was made according to the laws, that are by the Lawgiver designed to govern the case. Let us see what is necessary, then, admitting that an original conveyance was made. What must the present incumbent prove, to make out this title? It is essential that he show a perfect chain from himself up to the Apostles. That each link, or person in that chain, was canonically inducted into that place, or that each instrument of conveyance was legally made out. That as the original charter requires certain moral qualifications, therein stated, of all who fill or exercise this office, it is essential, that it be clearly shown, that all such person or persons thus elevated, possessed, not only at the time of their consecration, but at all times when they performed the act of ordination, all those excellencies which the scriptures point out as requisite traits of God's ministers.

Can these points be established? Will Mr. B. trace his title from Peter at Rome? Why, he cannot prove that Peter was ever at Rome, much less that he was the fixed and resident Bishop there. Will he trace it from Paul? Who can prove that Paul was the Bishop of that Diocese; elevated to that office by a triple consecration performed by canonical Bishops? There is no proof of either facts in the case. Thus they are defective in proof in their first link. They say that Linus succeeded either Peter or Paul, they do not know which; but, who was Linus? What moral qualifications did he possess, and how was he elevated to the Episcopate? Who can tell? No one. Here, then, the title is broken; for its validity cannot be established. But, who succeeded Linus? Some say one, some another; some say, three held it in co-ordinate jurisdiction; others denounce this position as infamous. Thus we might go on, and every step would show, that this stream, as one of their own Prelates said, is as “muddy as the Tiber itself.”

Will Mr. B. attempt to trace the succession through the Anglican Church? Who then was its first Diocesan Bishop? Will he say that it was Paul? Where is the proof, not the supposition, but the proof that Paul was? Stillingfleet says, “that by the loss of records of the British Churches, we *cannot* draw down the succession of Bishops from the Apostle's times.” Rev. Henry Cary says, “we have no mention of Bishops in the British Church, nor do we find *any further* information on that subject ~~AT ALL~~, until the year 314.” Rev. E. Bloomfield says, “on the authority of the British triades, we are informed, that Caractacus, a valiant British Prince, having been carried prisoner to Rome, found the Gospel preached in that city; and saw, in progress of time, Brennus and some others of his family, converted to the

Christian Religion. On their return to Britain, they esteemed themselves happy, in being permitted to bear such a precious treasure to their countrymen. They were accompanied, by several christian teachers, among whom was Aristobulus, *probably* the same as is mentioned by the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Corinthians." This, and a mass of other testimony might be adduced to show, that the successional waters of the Anglican, are a branch of the Church of Rome; for who can show its separate starting point? And who can distinguish in the commingling of the streams during the revolutions, during the troubles and disorders of England, when sometimes the Pope was acknowledged as the supreme head of the Church, and sometimes the King; the consecration being sometimes received from Rome, and at other periods conferred by the act of the British Parliament. Had I space, I would present some examples of the manner in which this power in England and Scotland, from which the Rector professes to have derived his ordination, has been conveyed, which would show how frail the foundation is on which this mighty superstructure has been reared. As these are given in my Lectures, I will here only refer the reader to Powell on the succession, Neal's history of the Puritans, Bishop Burnet's history, Smyth's Lectures, Duffield on the succession, &c. where he will find facts in abundance.

It cannot be successfully denied, that up to the time of the Reformation the Roman and Anglican Churches were identical. At this time, the Church of Rome either was, or was not, a true Church. If a true Church, then it was schismatical for England to break off from her, and she and her daughter in this country are living in sin against God. If she was not a true Church, then she could not transfer to others what she did not possess herself, and all the ordinances in her branches are null and void. Again the English bishops were all excommunicated, at the time of the Reformation, by the Church of Rome, and, hence, she regards the English and the Protestant Episcopal Church, as being no part of the Church of Christ—having no part in the covenanted mercies of God, and destitute of the true succession. Now, if the promise, "Lo I am with you always," &c. means, as Mr. B. supposes, that Jesus Christ is with his Church to preserve the succession of Diocesan Prelates, we should expect, the evidence of its fulfilment would be seen in the preservation of registers, duly authenticated, sufficient to establish this claim so clear that he who runs might read. But, can they present any such Church Chronicles—any such documentary evidence? Surely, if the mouldering records of antiquity contained them, these ecclesiastical antiquarians—these lovers "of fables and endless genealogies" would have, ere this, drawn them forth. But such evi-

dence has not been adduced; and, hence, we have reason to conclude, that the title here claimed cannot be proved.

Another fact which has had some influence upon my mind as a Protestant, is, that this doctrine of personal succession constitutes a test of ministerial qualification, not anywhere to be found in the scriptures. Hence, it is of human, not of divine appointment; and would this corporation rest it upon this ground, and not claim a "divine warrant," we would not hold objections; but, they urge it as the great touch-stone of ministerial right. That there should be some test, all will admit; and as Jesus Christ established a ministry, it would be expected, that some test would be instituted, and if one can be found in the Book of Laws which He has left his Church, this most certainly, should have the preference to all others. To the law, then, and to the testimony, what saith the Scriptures? "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God." Why? "Because many false prophets are gone out into the world." Try them how? What is the criteria which the Scriptures furnish—the test which they propose by which the claims of these teachers are to be adjudged? Is it by tracing their title through a long series of uninterrupted baptisms and ordinations, of a given description up to the Apostles? Who would be sufficient for these things? Is this the scriptural test? No. The test that God has instituted, like his works is simple, upon a level with the capacity of all, and can be applied in the absence of all proof from lineal descent, or the moth eaten and interpolated records of the Romish Church. It is a test of *character*. This test was that by which Jesus Christ himself wished to be tried. "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not." And so said the Apostles, "If I be not an Apostle to others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of my Apostleship, are ye, in the Lord." "*Approving* ourselves as the ministers of God," "by pureness; by knowledge; by long suffering; by kindness; by the Holy Spirit; by love unfeigned; by the word of truth; by the power of God; by the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left." "Be thou an example of the believers in word; in conversation; in charity; in spirit; in faith; in purity. In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing uncorruptedness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you." "Ye shall know them," says Christ, "by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." Here is the law—the test which the scriptures have laid down in the case. A law of plain, common,

versal application. One suited to all ages and all climes; to all classes and conditions of life. One that the poor and ignorant can apply as skilfully as the most affluent and learned. Purity of life; soundness of doctrine, and a ministry blessed of God in the conversion and salvation of men. These are the scriptural critera—the visible test of a true ministry of Jesus Christ. High Churchmen may dispute about the sufficiency of this test and attempt a course of argument to disprove it, and, with the Romanist, deny the sufficiency of the scriptures, but as the late Bishop Emory said, “their controversy is with their Master, who expressly affirms, and establishes it, and whether we ought to believe *him* or *them*, the reader must judge.” Their reasoning here is a denial of one of the first principles of the Reformation, viz. that the scriptures are a sufficient rule both of faith and practice.

But what is the test which the advocates of a personal succession set up? What the criterion which they introduce, by which the right to minister in holy things is decided? So far from its being a test of *character*, by their *faith*, *purity*, or *fruits*, it is a test based upon a pedigree through a series of Prelatical Baptisms, confirmations and ordinations to the Apostles—a test which admits as true ministers, the “Sons of Belial”—the “Messengers of Satan,” who have no inheritance in the kingdom of God—whom the Saviour called “*false prophets*”; those of whom John says, “receive them not,” and Paul says, “Let them be accursed.” Nevertheless a Prelate of the succession by virtue of

“His *Royal letters* which as a thing of course,
A King, that would, might recommend his horse ;
And Deans no doubt, and Chapters, with one voice,
As bound in duty, would confirm his choice.
Behold your Bishop : well he plays his part,
Christian in name, and infidel in heart,
Ghostly in office, earthly in his plan,
A slave at Court, elsewhere a lady’s man.
Dumb, as a Senator, and as a Priest,
A piece of mere Church furniture at best :
To live estranged from God his total scope,
And his end sure, without one glimpse of hope.”

By virtue of this royal patent, these descendants of the Apostles though their vices, “would exhaust the catalogue of human crimes,” have yet in their possession from St. Peter, “the keys of the kingdom of heaven”! A test, which setting aside the scriptural rule, receives the teacher of lies, the infidel, the drunkard, and even the murderer, as “Apostolic Bishops,” merely because he has received ordination from a triple consecrated Prelate no better than himself, and rejects the faithful man, who meets the scriptural standard, as a “*false prophet*.” Are the scriptures sufficient to make us wise unto salvation? Was the

Christian Religion designed for a universal religion? Are its immunities and blessings secured to the illiterate and poor? Is the way so plain that a way-faring man, though a fool shall not err therein? Then, this test is superfluous, unnecessary and sinful,

“Inventions added in a fatal hour,
Human appendages of pomp and power,
 Whatever shines in outward grandeur great :
 I give it up—*a creature of the State.*
 Wide of the CHURCH, as hell from heaven is wide,
 The blaze of riches, and the glare of pride,
 The vain desire to be entitled *LORD*,
 The worldly kingdom and the princely sword.
 But should the bold usurping spirit dare
 Still higher climb, and sit in Moses’ chair,
 Power o’er my faith and conscience to maintain,
 Shall I submit and suffer it to reign?
 Call it the CHURCH, and darkness put for light,
 Falsehood with truth confound, and wrong with right?
 No ; I dispute the evil’s haughty claim,
 The spirit of the world be still its name,
 Whatever call’d by man, ‘tis purely evil,
 ‘Tis Babel, anti-Christ, and Pope, and *Devil*’.

Another feature in this doctrine of personal succession not calculated to inspire in my mind much deference, is, its strong savor of Rome. I will notice but one item; “the power of absolution,” now so openly advocated by these successionists. No feature in Popery was more odious to the Reformers than this; and none has been a greater scandal to the Christian religion. It is true, these gentlemen do not go the whole length of Rome, when “every crime was rated in the Church tax-book and vice became a marketable commodity to be sold to the highest bidder,” yet, I think any one, who examines with any degree of care their works, will see the more prominent essential features of the system portrayed. Take the following as examples. Bishop Hobart says, “where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church by participation of its ordinances, at the hands of a duly authorized priesthood, is the *indispensable condition of salvation.*” Dr. Ravenscroft says, “the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments, are as distinctly and truly appointments of God, for the salvation of sinners, as the faith of the Gospel, and that it is only, as these are united in the profession of religion, can the hope, thereby given to a man, be worthy of the name of assurance.” He considered “the grace and mercy of the Gospel as matters of *strict covenant stipulation*; as bound up with the authority to dispense them; as *inseparable* from that authority; and **ONLY BY VIRTUE OF THAT AUTHORITY** (with reverence be it spoken) *pledging* the glorious source of all mercy and grace to

his creatures." Bishop Meade, of Va., as quoted by Mr. Smith, believes, "that before Jesus Christ left the world He breathed His Holy Spirit into the Apostles, giving them the power of transmitting this precious gift, to others, by prayer, and the imposition of hands; that the Apostles did so transmit it to others, and they again to others; and that in this way, it has been preserved in the world to the present day. That the gift thus transmitted empowers its possessor, 1st, to admit into, and to exclude from, the mysterious communion, called, in scripture the Kingdom of heaven, any one whom they may judge deserving of it, and this, with the assurance, that all whom they admit or exclude on earth, and externally, are admitted or excluded in heaven, spiritually, in the sight of God and holy Angels; that it empowers men to bless, and to intercede for those who are within His Kingdom, in a sense, in which no other man can bless or intercede: 2d, to make the Eucharistic bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, in the sense in which our Lord made it so: 3d, to enable delegates to perform this great miracle, by ordaining them with imposition of hands." Hence, the Bishop deduces the following conclusion: "According to this view of the subject to dispense with Episcopal ordination is to be regarded, not as a breech of order merely, or a deviation from Apostolic precedent, but as a surrender of the Christian Priesthood, a *réjection* of all the powers, which Christ instituted Episcopacy to perpetuate; and the attempt to institute any other form for it, or to *SEEK COMMUNION WITH CHRIST*, through any non-Episcopal association, is to be regarded not as schism merely, but as an *IMPOSSIBILITY*" The same doctrine is advanced by the Bishop of Michigan in quotations I have already made, in addition to which, I extract the following. Christian ministers "are especially to tell men, that it is only through this ministry, that pardon and acceptance with God, can be made known." Their work is, "to pronounce and declare to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins." To say nothing of the spirit of exclusiveness, such sentiments breathe—so much like Peter when he shrunk from all contact with what *he* called common or unclean—so much like Jewish bigotry—a spirit that would build a wall of partition between the Protestant E. Church, and all other Churches high as heaven—which says to all out of her communion, stand thou there, for I am holier than thou—a spirit that only excites our pity, as we believe "there is neither Greek, nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all in all." Without saying any thing of the consignment in these quotations to endless perdition all the members of other Churches, I simply refer to the doctrine of "absolution from sin" so clearly set forth. To what part of the scriptures shall we turn for proof that Jesus Christ has made his min-

isters "his agents authorized to tell man that his sins are forgiven"? This is a doctrine that gives to man a power unknown to the scriptures. Instead of the minister's making this proclamation, the scriptures agree with Charles Wesley in saying,

"The SPIRIT answers to the blood
And TELLS ME I am born of God."

Well did Dr. Rice, in reply to Bishop Ravenscroft, say, "it shall be for a lamentation that ministers of religion, in this enlightened age, are running back into the darkness of the 12th century; and that any of our countrymen allow prejudices to sway their minds, that they admit the claims of men, who set up to be *accredited agents of heaven and substitutes of Jesus Christ.*" "We will not take the assertion of any Bishop or Priest, that they are the high dignitaries of Heaven, sent forth to negotiate the sinner's pardon, or *authoritatively to declare the fact that he has been pardoned.*" "Since the Bishop puts the matter on this ground, we *demand that HE shows us HIS POWER OF ATTORNEY, duly authenticated.*" I reject the doctrine of a personal succession, because, I conceive it contains the very essence of Popery, and that in more things than one.

I venerate it not because it is worthless. Says a learned Protestant divine, "the power of saving men's souls, depends not upon succession of persons, according to human institutions, but upon the Apostolic doctrine, accompanied by the divine spirit. If upon the exercise of their ministerial power, men are converted, and find comfort in their doctrine and sacraments, and at their end deliver up their souls to God their Redeemer, and that with unspeakable joy; this is a divine confirmation of their ministry, and the same more real and manifest than any personal succession." What else is of value, compared with the salvation of the soul? I would introduce no invidious comparison, but *the people* can judge of the blessings of succession in making a pious and useful ministry; a holy and self-denying Church.

I respect it not, because, it rests upon assumption; not on proof. A proposition which, if true, would unchristianize one half of the professed disciples of Christ—that would condemn as the associates of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, thousands of the most learned, pious, and successful ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ that have ever blessed the world. Surely of such a proposition we might expect the most ample proof, the most incontestible evidence, and we might look for its advocates to adduce this proof before they presumed to urge so arrogant and exclusive a claim. But proof here is the last thing thought of. When pressed for this the usual reply is, "as to the *fact* of the Apostolical succession, &c. this is too notorious to require proof. Every link of the chain is known from St. Peter to our present Metropolitans."—

(*Tract No. 7, p. 2.*) If every link is known, then they might be easily presented. And if they are known to be sound, it would not be to their injury but to their advantage to present their evidence; that each link was placed there and remained there according to canonical order and scriptural requirements, and we promise to follow the chain and the evidence with the test of our Savior, applying it fairly link by link, and abide the result, either showing the evidence to be defective or embracing the dogma. But to urge these claims in the absence of this proof, and that too in the face of such opposing declarations, as the following, made by their leading divines, "that there is not a minister in all christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree"; that "the succession of persons is so uncertain, that whosoever shall make the being of a Church, or the ministry, or the power of the sacraments, depend upon it, shall so offend Jesus Christ's little ones, and be guilty of such a scandal, as it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck and he cast into the sea." To urge such assumptions, under such circumstances, is an arrogance not to be respected, and which in my opinion is not guiltless in the sight of God.

I venerate it not, because it introduces a new condition of salvation. The scriptures present the human family as divided into two great classes, the enemies, and the friends of God. It becomes then a question of infinite moment, how can the former become the latter? The high Church hypothesis says, with Bishop Hobart, "In this *regenerating* ordinance [Baptism] fallen man is *born again*, from a state of *condemnation* into a state of *grace*." "Our Church," says he, "in all her services considers *Baptized* christians [i.e. baptized persons] as *regenerate*; as called to a state of *salvation*; as made *members* of *Christ*; children of God; heirs to the kingdom of heaven." With the Rev. Mr. Melville: "We really think no fair, no straight forward dealing can get rid of the conclusion; that the Church holds what is called baptismal regeneration." "So long as I officiate according to the forms of the Prayer Book I do not see how I can be commonly honest, and yet deny that every *Baptized* person is, on that account, *regenerate*." And what saith the Prayer Book? "Then shall the minister say, seeing, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is *regenerate*, and grafted into Christ by baptism," &c. "*Regenerate by baptism*"? The faith of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as set forth in her formularies of devotion and explained by her Prelates, is, that the child of wrath becomes the child of God by baptism; that by this ordinance they become heirs of the kingdom, children of God, in a state of grace and salvation. But is this the condition found in the Bible? There baptism is spoken of as an outward rite, a symbol of an inward

change. What said Paul, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?" Why baptized? To bring them under the influence of the Holy Ghost? No; but, because they "have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Paul also says, "Jesus Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." To the Jailor he said, when inquired of what he should do to be saved, "BELIEVE on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." "REPENT, that your sins may be blotted out." "Thy FAITH *hath* saved thee." "Circumcision, is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but a new CREATURE." These are the conditions which the scriptures present, but how do they compare with the high Church dogma, that "repentance, faith, and obedience will not of *themselves* be effectual to our salvation." "The *only* mode through which we can obtain a title to these [Gospel] blessings is the sacrament of baptism." Such a right claimed by this corporation to institute new terms of salvation not known in the scriptures—to confer a title to salvation upon whomsoever they may see fit to sprinkle holy water and make the sign of the cross, as *Protestants*, we reject as containing in all its length and breadth the *opus operatum* of Rome.

I reject it, because it introduces anti-scriptural tests of our acceptance with God. The question according to this theory, with the Laity now is, are the genealogical credentials of my minister, from whom I have received baptism and the Lord's Supper, correct? This being settled in the affirmative, all is well. By the former I have been regenerated, and by the latter received the life-giving Bread from Heaven. The reception of Church sacraments from an authorized minister, be he never so great a sinner, removes at once all fear of the wrath of God and inspires the hope of heaven. Hence, as the London Observer says, "the preachers of this school address their auditors almost promiscuously as christians, because, professedly and by the sacrament of baptism, they are such. Our view, on the other hand, is, that a large portion of them, are not christians, except in name; and should, therefore, be addressed, not merely as needing to be exhorted to higher advances in goodness and virtue, but to *become* christians in the spiritual sense of the term." The test is, have you received the sacraments? not that you *FEEL* "His bliss inspiring presence." Which of these tests are evangelical and scriptural, the reader must judge. The poet who had tried the former, becoming convinced of its insufficiency, thus expressed himself:

" Long have I seem'd to serve thee, Lord,
With unavailing pain:
Fasted, and pray'd, and read thy word,
And heard it preached in vain.
Oft did I with the assembly join,
And near thy altar drew,

A *form* of godliness was mine,
 The *poor* I never knew.
 I rested in the *outward* law,
 Nor knew its deep design :
 The length and breadth I never *saw*,
 And height of love divine.
 To please thee thus at length I see,
 Vainly I hop'd and strove ;
 For what are *outward* things to thee,
 Unless they spring from *love* ?
 I see the *perfect* law requires
 Truth in the *inward* parts ;
 Our *full* consent, our *whole* desires,
 Our *undivided* hearts.
 But I of *means* have made my boast,
 Of means an *idol* made :
 The *spirit* in the *letter* lost,
 The *substance* in the *shade*.
 Where am I now, or what my hope ?
 What can my weakness do ?
 Jesus, to thee my soul looks up :
 'Tis THOU must make it new."

Who does not see in the successional test not only an entrenching upon the rights of other Churches, but an advance of formalism, a corruption of the truth, a counteracting of the influences of a *spiritual* christianity, and a war upon the dearest interests of our race? Who that has cast his eye over the world and watched the movements in Europe and America, for a few of the last years, but is convinced that there are two principles in Church and two in State, which are fast arraying themselves for conflict. It is *formal* religion against *spiritual* christianity: it is the *free* institutions of law and equality against those of *will* and *arbitrary* distinction; and, as the Rev. Mr. Eddy says, "let the issue be joined, the world is prepared for it. It may now be the conflict of argument, and not of arms; of mind redeemed, free, sanctified. Let charity be our spirit, truth our weapons, and God the umpire." The aristocracy of formalism is seeking to wield over the new world the iron sceptre of the "man of sin." Let it prevail, and the incubus of death will be upon a spiritual religion. It is time the friends of *spiritual* christianity spoke out. Silence now, would be falsehood. Let them arise, and in love meet the claims of this *new* religion. We need not despair: truth will triumph, and the world be regenerated by the *Spirit* of the Lord of hosts!

The above is the first chapter of reasons why I do not esteem very highly the doctrine of a personal succession. When these are disposed of, I will present others. In closing my remarks upon this subject, I will present two extracts from the writings of Churchmen, which I recommend to the special notice of the Rector. The first is from Taylor's *Spiritual Christianity*, and reads thus:—"In proportion as the gospel is understood in its *purity*

and in its *power*—in proportion as it is felt to be a *spiritual* religion, its independence of whatever is local and visible will the more appear; not, indeed, to the disparagement of visible institutions, but the higher glory of the spiritual reality. It seems scarcely to need proof, that any system of opinions, the purport and tendency of which is, to give an unusual prominence and a paramount importance to *visible* institutions, and especially as historically defined, and which with a severe consistency, denies the very name of Christian to whatever may be found beyond its pale, or may not acknowledge its jurisdiction; that such a system, so far as it takes effect, stands opposed to whatever is the most auspicious in the present age, and if permitted to work its will, must turn back the current of human affairs a thousand years, and would confine the blessings of the gospel within limits narrower than those of ancient Judaism. These *exclusive opinions*, so fondly embraced by many, are indeed, ‘a discipline of the secret,’ likely enough to bury the gospel in a cloister along with the last hopes of happiness for mankind.”

The other extract is from Arch Deacon Hare. “I cannot but make mention of a notion which has been brought forward somewhat prominently by certain very amiable and pious men in our days, viz. that our Lord’s promise was not made to the collective body of His Church, to that body of which He is the Head, the blessed communion of all faithful people, in all nations and through all ages, but that it was confined to the Apostles exclusively, as the supposed representative of the Episcopal body, and that none are embraced in it, except the same Episcopal body, unto the end of the world. You would join with me, I would fain hope, in the earnest desire to purge our Church from all remains of that Judaizing *Romish* superstition, which would wrap up the free spirit of the gospel in the swathing bonds of forms and ceremonies, and would tether it to a name.”

“That amiable and pious men should have taken up such a notion, which leads straightway to the most revolting conclusions, according to which the chief part of Protestant Christendom is cast out at once by a sweeping interdict from the pale of Christ’s Church, nay, is recklessly declared to stand on a level with the heathen, and to be left to *the uncovenanted mercies of God*, that able and pious men should not shrink with awe from such a notion, that they should take it up under any thing less than the clearest, most compulsory, most irresistible demonstration, that they should not look carefully and anxiously around for some mode of escaping from such appalling conclusions, might be deemed unaccountable, if we did not remember how prone we all are to convert every object of our peculiar interest and affection, even the objects of our purest worship, into idols. This is the last wall of the citadel in which the selfishness of man takes

refuge and barricades itself; and it can hardly be thrown down altogether, so long as we continue here below. Our form of government, must be the only good form of government, not because it is a good one, but because *it is ours*. Our Church must be the only Church, not because it is founded on truth, few examine its foundation; still fewer examine the foundations of other churches with patience, and candor, and honesty, and a righteous self-distrust: no, our Church is *ours*, and therefore, it is the only true one. We still cannot bear to think that the veil of the temple should have been rent; we still cannot bear that the Gentiles should have a free approach to the Holy of holies; we cannot bear that our neighbors should come to it by any other road than ours. * * * I can only express my regret that, where such strong arguments in favor of Episcopacy may be drawn from the history and idea of the Church, many of its advocates, not content with proving that it is the best form of Church government, have resolved to make out that it is the only one, and have tried to rest it upon scriptural grounds, which in fact only weakens their cause. For I cannot discover the shadow of a word in the Gospels to counter-balance the interpretation referred to. Feeble and flimsy as are the Scriptural arguments, on which the Romanists maintain the inalienable primacy of St. Peter, they are far more specious and plausible than those derived from the same source, on the strength of which it has been attempted to establish the absolute necessity of Episcopacy to the existence of a Christian Church."

"Let us my brethren, carefully beware of that most hurtful and narrow-minded of monopolies which would monopolize the grace of God. The way to life is narrow enough: let us not throw up any fresh mounds by its side, to render it narrower still. Let us rejoice that the salvation which Christ wrought for his people is not tied to any thing that man set up, or that man can pull down. Let us rejoice that in Christ Jesus neither *Episcopacy* availeth any thing, nor anti-Episcopacy, but a new creature. Let us rejoice that the gospel was to be preached to all nations, and that all nations were to be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Admirable sentiments! Sentiments which will live when exclusiveness shall be burnt out by the spirit of a pure gospel. How pitiful do the arrogant claims in the tract, circulated, and now circulating by the Rector of St. James', and so strikingly condemned in the extract above, appear, by the side of these noble sentiments. These extracts are the more valuable not only on account of their fully defining the war now made upon Churches fancied to be out of the succession, but, because they come from Church of England-men condemning more fully than I have done the whole course of Mr. Bolles and the high Church party, and using language which had it come from me would have been called "reproachful epithets," of "re-

cent origin," &c., &c. The sentiment of the extracts accord with the scriptures. They breathe the spirit of the Gospel. Neither in or out of this succession will avail the minister anything at the bar of God, but a new creature, and, hence, the rejoicing of Paul at the close of his ministry was—not that a triple consecrated prelate had ordained him—but "the testimony of a good conscience, that not by fleshly wisdom but by the grace of God, he had his conversation in the world;" that he was pure from the blood of all men, because he had "not shunned to declare the whole council of God." To all such whether they can trace their ordination to Henry VIII or to John Wesley God will say

"Servant of God, well done ; well hast thou fought
 The better fight, who single hast maintained
 Against revolted multitudes the cause
 Of truth, in word mightier than they in arms ,
 And for the testimony of truth hast borne
 Universal reproach, far worse to bear
 Than violence ; for this was all thy care,
 To stand approved in sight of God, though worlds
 Judged thee perverse.
 Fearless of men and devils ; unabashed
 By sin enthroned, or mockery of a prince,
 Unawed by armed legions, unseduced
 By offered bribes, burning with love to souls
 Unquenchable, and mindful still of your
 Great charge and vast responsibility,
 High in the the temple of the living God,
 You stood, amid the people, and declared
 Aloud the truth, the whole *revealed* truth,
 Ready to seal it with your blood."

But if he has been false to his trust, regardless of the responsibility and sanction of his office; or actuated by any other than pure motives, whether in or out of the succession, though his ordination be as canonical as John Tetzel's or as uncanonical as Archbisch^p Parker's,—

"He was a Wolf in clothing of th^e Lamb,
 That stole into the fold of God, and on
 The blood of souls, which he did sell to death
 Grew fat ; and yet when any would have turned
 Him out, he cried, 'Touch not the priest of God.'"

Verily he shall receive his reward. His *royal letters* shall be no guarantee of acquittal at the bar of Jehovah. His hands stained with the blood of souls, those will not cleanse.

"His end is sure, without one glimpse of hope."

Finally does not Mr. B. absolve me from all blame in attacking the Church. 1st. On the ground that it was at the instigation of others. 2d. I was ignorant of the points at issue, and of the facts in the case. I deny, however, having attacked *the Church* either at my own, or at the instigation of others. As to my ignor-

ance of the points at issue, and the facts in the case, it becomes me not to speak. I understood the facts to be the existence of certain tracts in this community through a certain agency, and the point at issue, the truth or falsity of the facts and doctrines thus disseminated. Neither do I admit, that Mr. Bolles has a knowledge of my intentions, or the prerogative to absolve me from sin, at least, until it is confessed, as this would be in *advance* of Rome. Thus I have gone over the charges, which this "*Defender of the Faith*" has brought against me, and I trust have said sufficient, to show, that they have no foundation in truth. Hence, I feel justified in all that I have said or done in this matter. Whether these feelings are right or not I leave for the reader to decide.

CHAP. XIV.

MR. BOLLES' ATTACK UPON METHODIST EPISCOPACY, *alias* DR. COKE.

Ecclesiastical History unsatisfactory—intemperate spirit of party—necessity of Reviewing this part of Mr. B's work—his circulating the pamphlets a trifling affair—his justification of this attack upon Methodist Episcopacy—our claims and the test by which he tries them—our recognition by the English Methodists—the source of our Episcopacy—the true issue—the harmless character of the one now instituted.

“DR. ADAM CLARKE has expressed the opinion, in his Letter to a Preacher, that though we should not be unacquainted with the History of the Church, yet, except that which is contained in the Acts of Apostles, the study is the most jejune and unsatisfactory, in the whole compass of human knowledge. The late eminent Dr. Jortin, expressed a nearly similar sentiment, thus—that ecclesiastical history is a sort of enchanted land, where it is hard to distinguish truth from false appearances; and a maze which requires more than Ariadne's clue. The authority of *antiquity*, he adds, that hand-maid to *scripture*, as she is called, is like *Briareus*, and has a hundred hands; and the hands often clash and beat one another. Those then, who undertake to assert, with dogmatical positiveness, what was ancient ecclesiastical usage ‘in every instance,’ ought first to perform the preliminary task of satisfying us that they are better acquainted with antiquity, and have more critical acumen, than either Dr. Clarke, or Dr. Jortin. In doing which, if they succeed to convince us that they are more learned, they will hardly, at the same time, impress us with a conviction of their superior modesty.

“The only ecclesiastical history on which certain dependance can be placed, is that which is contained in the Holy Scriptures. And there we find no specific form of Church polity, either prescribed, or even uniformly acted on. How is it possible, then, that this subject can be one of such vital importance, and of such all absorbing interest, as some of our opponents would have it? For it is on this point alone that they profess to differ from us,—and yet think this difference sufficient to justify the severance of the dearest and most sacred ties! This is, indeed, making of Church polity a ‘poisonous tree, which, instead of affording shel-

ter to the neighboring plants, causes them to sicken and wither beneath its baleful influence;—whilst it yields a friendly covering to weeds and nettles; beasts of prey lodge safely at its root; and birds of ill omen scream in its branches.'

"Of all the distempers with which poor mortals are afflicted, in the great infirmary of this world, an intemperate spirit of party seems to be not the most infrequent, or the least contagious, or inveterate. Indeed, when it has once attained a certain height, it defies the healing art, and mocks the bands both of reason and religion; which are severed before it as a thread at touch of fire. A perverted imagination feeds the disorder, and deludes the angry disputant with her hideous phantoms; and on these he spends his rage, as if they were real substantial foes. Such seems to us to be the circumstances in which the violence and injustice of assailants, compel us to defend ourselves in the present controversy."—(*Bishop Emory, Meth. Mag. vol. 12, p. 69.*)

Upon first reading Mr. Bolles' "Examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy" I concluded, that it would not be best to swell the size of my Review, but confine myself to a brief notice of it. I was led to this conclusion by the following reasons: 1st. Mr. B's examination contains no other facts or arguments, than such as our enemies have urged, through the press and pulpit, against us, again and again. 2d. These facts and arguments have frequently been met, canvassed, and refuted by men of superior ability and influence to myself. 3d. Mr. B's examination, proceeds upon principles which, however well sustained, affect not, in the least, even the out-posts of our organization. He has made up an issue which meets not the case he proposes to examine. Should it be admitted that his witnesses are unimpeachable, his evidence most direct and conclusive, and all his deductions logical, it makes nothing against the structure he proposes to assail; for any one acquainted with the Methodist E. Church, knows, that it is a very different edifice from that against which his artillery is aimed; and, hence, Methodist Episcopacy has not only survived the intended shock, but its friends would not have known, from the issue, that he designed to assail it. In this, the caption of his letter is very essential, inasmuch as by announcing the name of the object whose claims he proposes to examine, he thereby removes that doubt upon the mind of the reader which a perusal of his letter might otherwise create. This naming at the commencement of the letter, the thing with which he conceives he is contending, seems to rest upon the same necessity which induces the school-boy to place above the figures he may have rudely and grotesquely sketch'd as representations, in his own fancy, of a certain object, the name of that which he had in view to delineate. I had, therefore, deemed it unnecessary at first, to attempt any reply to this portion of Mr. B's work, but the

following reasons have induced me to change my course. It has been urged, 1st. That the defense should be maintained as long as the fire is kept up by our assailants. 2d. That although there is nothing new in this examination of Mr. Bolles', and, although the old material has been frequently disposed of, yet as it comes up in a new dress, from a new assailant, it will probably reach a new class of readers not before reached by former efforts of this kind, and hence the necessity that a new answer by a new defender should be prepared for the benefit of this new class of readers. But more than all, 3d. As the issue is new to multitudes who are ignorant of the real points at issue between high Churchmen and Methodists, they will not be able to detect the failure of Mr. B. in correctly stating his case, nor will discriminate between what does and does not appear against us, and being thus blinded at the outset they will be led to draw wrong inferences, and come to erroneous conclusions, placing a false estimate upon the value of this portion of the work. 4th. That as other defensive efforts of ours have been directed against different issues no one meets precisely the case now before us. I have, therefore, concluded that in carrying out my title page "to correct the errors and misrepresentations of the work Reviewed," it would be proper for me to give it a more extended notice than at first I deemed necessary. With this conclusion I proceed to Review this pretended attack upon Methodism; assuring the reader that I shall dispose of it in as short a space as possible, and, at the same time, give to those not familiar with our history, the information essential to form correct opinions of the facts and reasonings of Mr. B.

Mr. Bolles commences his examination, by announcing to his readers, that his circulating the pamphlets in this community, attacking the institutions of our Church, with which he was charged, was a very trifling affair; and he thinks it quite marvelous, that this small offense should arouse the members of the Methodist E. Church to vindicate themselves against the allegations therein contained. He affirms it to be folly in the extreme, that "grave and reverend ministers" should be engaged in controversy by such a circumstance. To say nothing of the virtual admission here of all, with which by us he has been charged, and to disprove which was the object of a large portion of his work, it is quite marvelous to me, that the fact of the extreme foolishness of this controversy did not force itself upon his mind at the time he commenced it. The only reason that I can assign for this clearer perception of his folly at this stage of the controversy is, that having now brought out all his facts, and arguments, and expended all his skill in the manufacture of sophistry, he had so far failed even in his own estimation, of making out a probable justification of his course, that the folly of the controversy he had

provoked, forced itself upon him with a vividness of which he had not before been conscious. From this decision of Mr. B. I presume no one of his readers will dissent. Whether the circulating of pamphlets in this community, attacking the institutions of all sister Churches, was a trifling affair, or not, the reader will be able to judge after having examined our expose of their doctrines found on the preceding pages of this work. It may, indeed, be considered a trifling affair, in his estimation, to excommunicate all other Churches than the Protestant Episcopal from the pale of the Christian Church—to denounce them as schismatics, hypocrites and impostors—to stamp all their ordinances with spuriousness, and to warn the people to beware how in any way they countenance such awful rebellion against God, and to advise them to avoid participation in such daring iniquity, as they would wish to escape the doom of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram! He may think it a trifling affair thus to stigmatize and criminate his neighbors—thus to rob them of their altars; their sacraments; their spiritual homes; and to hold them up to the world as fit objects of scorn and ridicule. So no doubt the Papist considers it a trifling affair to take away the Bible from the people—to deny them the right of private judgment—to coerce men to embrace their dogmas, by burning heretics at the stake; or dislocating their limbs upon the rack; but, will a Republican, a Protestant community, consider it a trifling affair for a *sect* who are but of yesterday to set up such exclusive claims and utter and propagate such denunciatory sentiments? Mr. B. may consider it a trifling affair, to scatter such pamphlets over this region, and to pour forth from his pulpit the sentiments contained in them, from Sabbath to Sabbath; but when members of a neighboring Church, feeling aggrieved by such a course, take it upon themselves, as a duty which they owe to the world and slandered dead, to correct, through their pulpit, the errors and misrepresentations thus created, it becomes in the estimation of the Rev. Gentleman a very different matter—a very serious affair; and all the Jesuitism of Rome is laid under contribution, and the tactics of the most arch-politician left far in the shade, to cripple and put down a people, who have dared to resist the aggression, and thus call in question the infallibility of “THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES”!

However trifling or foolish Mr. B. may have been in getting up the matter of the first 74 pages of his work, he now promises his readers a subject worthy of their attention—“a subject which,” he says, “should not be allowed to slumber, and which at all times is a fair and legitimate subject for impartial inquiry,” viz. “the claims of Methodist Episcopacy.” This is a subject which, in his opinion, “ought not to slumber,” and any one acquainted with the doings of Protestant Episcopalians knows, full well, that many of his communion have entertained similar views

and feelings, and under their influence, they have drawn up the most frightful caricatures of Methodism, and scattered them broad cast through the length and breadth of our land. Methodist Episcopacy has had no slumber, but what could be obtained amid the din of battle and the constant commotions of war. If agitation is necessary to purity surely the absence of purity here will not be owing to a lack of service on the part of Protestant Episcopalians. But we have reason to thank God that all the storm of elements without, which the enemies of the Methodist Episcopal Church have provoked, have not shook her foundation or driven her from her course. She still wields, successfully, the sword of the spirit. Still advances to new conquests over the empire of sin; and though high Churchmen may denounce her credentials, she gives most indubitable evidence of having the divine approval—of bearing the signature of heaven, that the “Lord of Hosts is with her, and the God of Jacob her defense.”

The subject of “Methodist Episcopacy,” Mr. B. thinks, “is at all times” a proper subject of investigation. Without calling in question the correctness of this sentiment, which, duly qualified I have no disposition to do, I will simply inquire, how he would like to have the tables turned. It is a poor rule that does not work with equal justice both ways. The maxim of the Gospel is, “whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them.” Suppose, then, without cause or provocation, that I had publicly examined the claims of Protestant Episcopacy, and assigned, as a reason of this attack, that the subject “was one which at all times was a fair and legitimate one for investigation”; think you the Rector would have admitted this as a valid and satisfactory justification of my course? What do facts say? Why, because I preached four Sermons in our pulpit, in defense of our organization against the attacks of Mr. B. I am complained of as a very ungentlemanly Clergyman—an assailant upon the Episcopal Church—and a pamphlet of nearly 200 pages is issued to defend *the* Church against the assault. Is it to be admitted, then, that an examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy is at all times proper, but its defense never? I argue that if such examination into our claims is at all times proper, then just and equal rules decide that a similar examination into the claims of Protestant Episcopacy is at all times proper; and much more is it proper that we should defend ourselves when our claims are unjustly repudiated. How triumphantly then, though unwittingly, has he justified, and more than justified, my course—that all his complaints are causeless—an effort to excite public sympathy, where none is deserved and where none should be bestowed. But has he justified himself? His justification of this assault upon Methodism fails inasmuch as it does not meet his case. He affirms, “that it”—Methodist Episcopacy—“is at

all times a fair and legitimate subject of *impartial* inquiry." Now, if it is impartial to try its claims by a standard which it does not acknowledge—to strive to blacken the character of her founders by the introduction of testimony from her known and avowed enemies—to violate all the rules of interpretation in the construction of the statements of her ministers—to quote as authority, works which she has never admitted to be authentic, but condemned as unworthy of confidence—if such an examination is impartial, then, indeed, his justification meets his case: but if not, then it fails, and he is left without an apology. I think it will be made apparent to the reader, before he is through with the Review, that Mr. B's investigation of Methodist Episcopacy has no claim to impartiality, and, hence, his reason comes not within the case it was intended to justify.

Mr. Bolles having thus opened his cause by a plea of justification, proceeds to erect the standard by which the claims of this spurious Church are to be tried. He proposes to test her claims by "the well known principles of Episcopilians themselves," the Protestant E. Church being the Ultima Thule of all ecclesiastical matters. This is the bar to which Methodist Episcopacy is summoned, the laws, and the exposition of those laws, which are to govern the case, are such as she has furnished. The Methodists are charged in the bill of indictment, with claiming to possess, by divine right, Diocesan Episcopacy. The suit is brought by the Rector of St. James to test the validity of this claim. Now, I object, in the first place, to the *bar* before which we are arraigned, and to the *laws* which are to govern the case. If high Churchmen are to be the judges in this matter—if their principles are to control the ultimate decision, then it was unnecessary for Mr. B. to institute the trial, for they have long since given to the world, as their opinion, that our claims are spurious—that our orders are irregular—our sacraments and ordinance invalid: and Mr. Bolles himself, had endorsed the correctness of such decisions, by circulating in this community, pamphlets containing them. We may well inquire, by what authority are they to act as umpires in this case? They are a party in the suit—the complainants—and they assert that Methodists have trespassed upon their territory—have broken into their enclosures, and laid claim to titles and prerogatives exclusively their own. Having brought the charge, are they to fix the rules of trial and dictate the final decision? To such a course all honorable men would object as, unjust and partial. Is there not a higher tribunal—a common infallible standard, that takes cognizance and claims jurisdiction over both of these parties, and by which the claims of all Churches must be tried, and from which, there can be no appeal? If there be such a court of reference, then all must admit *that* is the bar before which Methodism should be arraigned, and the

rule by which her claims should be tested. What is this rule, and where is it to be found? As Protestants, we admit, that the Bible is the rule and the all sufficient rule both of faith and practice. To this we make our appeal—to the law and to the testimony as found in the Holy Scriptures. If our claims abide not this test, we yield them as worthless. And this, we affirm, is the only tribunal to which we are amenable—the only tribunal that has lawful jurisdiction over the case. Mr. B., then, by “*a petitio principii*,” a begging of the question, assuming as undisputed, the right of high Churchmen to sit as judges upon our claims, and approve or reject them by their own rules, has sought to try them “by the well known principles of *Episcopalians*,” instead of the well known principles of *the word of God!* With as much, and more propriety, might I try the claims of *Protestant* Episcopacy by the well known principles of *Papacy*, and because they fail in this test pronounce *their* claims to be invalid!!!

I object to the *charge* upon which we are arraigned—the claims of Methodists to high Church Episcopacy, or Episcopacy in a third order by divine right—because we have made no such claim, and hence, have committed no such depredation as is laid in the bill of charges. To sustain the charge brought by our accusers, on the issue here made, it would be necessary for them to show, first, what is a divine right? Second, that the Methodist E. Church claim Diocesan Episcopacy by such a right. And third, that their claim is not valid. The first question, then, is, what constitutes the divine right of bishops? The learned Stillingfleet, in his celebrated *Irenicum*, discussing the *nature* of a divine right, and showing on what it must be founded, says, “*jus* (law) is that which makes a thing to be become a duty: so *jus quasi jussum*, and *jussi jura*, as Festus explains it; that is, that whereby a thing is not only *licitum* (lawful) in man’s lawful power to do it or no, but is made *debitum*, (duty,) and is constituted a duty by the force and virtue of a *divine command*. Whatever binds christians as an universal standing law, must be clearly revealed as *such*, and laid down in scripture in such *evident terms*, as all who have their senses exercised therein, may discern to have been the *will* of Christ, that it should *perpetually oblige* all believers to the world’s end, as is clear in the case of baptism and the Lord’s supper.”—(*Iren. part 1. chap. I.*)

To make out a divine right, then, there must be an explicit statement in the scriptures of the duty claimed as one of *perpetual obligation*. And we may well ask our accusers, if any such explicit statement respecting their claim has yet, by them, been produced? Modest people would think it in time to arraign a neighbor upon the charge of trespass when one had established an indisputable title to occupancy. It would be very embarrass-

ing to Protestant Episcopalians to find, when challenged as to their right, that they were not able to show any original conveyance except by doubtful inference; and yet, that this is the true position of our accusers is known to them full well.

To the second inquiry, does the Methodist E. Church claim such an Episcopacy by such a right? We answer unhesitatingly, no. To what work of acknowledged authority in our Church will Mr. B. refer us, to prove, that we hold that Jesus Christ delegated to a corporation of triple consecrated prelates the exclusive right of ordination? Of perpetuating their own and the two lower orders of the ministry in regular order and succession, and that all ordinations, not performed by such triple consecrated prelates, in regular succession from those to whom the original conveyance was executed, viz., the Apostles, are null and void? What evidence will he adduce to prove, that we claim to have received through *such* a channel, *such* an ordination? The only proof presented or referred to, by Mr. Bolles, to establish this material point, is, the Annotations of Messrs. Coke and Asbury, from which he makes a quotation, or rather, selects sentences, and when put together as found in his work, present the sentiment of their authors about as fairly, as the author of tract No. 4 does the opinions of Mr. Wesley. On the page and the one preceding from which he makes his quotations, is the following language:—"the most bigoted devotees to religious establishments, (the clergy of the Church of Rome excepted,) are now ashamed to support the doctrine of *the Apostolic uninterrupted succession of Bishops*. Dr. Hoadly, bishop of Winchester, who was, we believe, the greatest advocate for Episcopacy, whom the Protestant Churches ever produced, has been so completely overcome by Dr. Calamy, in respect to the uninterrupted succession, that the point has been entirely given up. Nor do we recollect that any writer of the Protestant Churches has since attempted to defend what all the learned world at present know to be utterly indefensible. And yet, nothing but *an Apostolic uninterrupted succession* can possibly confine the right of Episcopacy to any particular Church." "It follows, therefore, indubitably, that every Church has a right to choose, if it please, the Episcopal plan." They then proceed to show that Mr. Wesley having recommended the *Episcopal plan*, the Episcopacy or Superintendency established in the Methodist E. Church was not a violation of any scriptural precept, but very nearly resembling the ecclesiastical arrangements of Churches in the early days of christianity; and for proof refer to the instances quoted by Mr. Bolles. This, then, was attempting to prove a very different thing than that claimed by Mr. B.—a very different thing from proving, that we had what a high Churchman woud call a divine right Episcopacy. So far from this, they positively affirm,

that the Protestant Churches at that time, had given up such a claim as indefensible; a dogma which they were ashamed to support. Whether this obvious misconstruction of the author's sentiment—which few would have the means of correcting, it being found in a work out of print—is attributable to stupidity or design, is not for me to settle. One thing, however, is certain, a cause that needs such advocacy must be feeble indeed.

Instead of claiming for our Church polity a divine right, (though we claim to have the divine sanction,) we affirm, that the scriptures contain no form of Church Government made binding by the command of God upon all people, in all ages, so that without the observance of certain formularies and specific consecrations, there can be no Church, no valid ministry, and sacraments. We repel such usurpations as savoring of Rome—as superstitions that had their origin in the darkest and most corrupt period of the Church. Such is the testimony, and all the testimony that Mr. B. introduces to prove, that we claim a high Church Episcopacy; on which he says, that with such testimony “there can be no mistake about the claims of this denomination to the divine right and *institution* of Diocesan Episcopacy!”

I think it must be plain to the reader, that however, skeptical Mr. B. is upon some points—and points, too, which are, clearly, matters of fact, he has the faculty of being remarkably credulous and very easily satisfied without evidence where it is convenient for his cause to be so. And, as if conscious of his perfect failure here, instead of proceeding to the third question, and testing the validity of our claim, he virtually admits the untenableness of his position, or, at least, his dissatisfaction with the case, by abruptly leaving it at this stage and commencing again on a different issue. Before, however, he proceeds he finds it convenient to make an assertion and propose a question. This assertion is as follows, “even now the *Episcopacy* of the Methodists in this country, is entirely repudiated by the Methodists in England; so much so that when the Canadian Methodists, a few years since, were admitted into union with the English Wesleyans, it was made an express condition that they should lay down their assumed Episcopal ordination, as derived from the American Methodists.” The most charitable construction that can be placed on this remarkable assertion, is, great *ignorance* upon the part of the Rector, of the subject upon which he has undertaken to write. One is at a loss to know of which he is the most worthy, our pity or our contempt. The assertions here made, are not only untrue, but, in the highest degree absurd. To what standard work of the Methodists in England—to what act of their Conference, will he refer, as proof that they reject the ordination of our Ministers as invalid? We have, as will be shown hereafter, not only the unsolicited approval of their leading di-

vines, but a formal sanction by their conference in the deputation and circular letters which they regularly send to our General Conference. Our ministers are recognized and received as ministers there, and theirs as such with us. By what authority then, does Mr. B. assert, that "the English Methodists repudiate our ordination?"* Equally false is it, that the English Wesleyans required any such express condition of the Canadian Methodists as Mr. Bolles asserts. At the time the Canadian preachers united with the British Conference, the British Wesleyan connexion had not introduced the practice of ordaining their preachers at all, and, therefore, could not have required a re-ordination of their Canadian brethren. They now ordain by the imposition of hands, and do not claim any but a Presbyterial ordination. They acted upon the principle so clearly stated and proved by Archbishop Whately, that every Church or Society of Christians have a right to create whatever officers their circumstances may require. What confidence is to be placed in the declaration of a man who makes assertions so foreign to the truth? And these are made at the opening of the case, when it is expected that being cool and collected a man will be cautious in his statements. What may we not look for when he comes to argument and application? The question proposed by Mr. B. is, "where did the Methodists in this country obtain the Episcopacy? If he means by this, such an Episcopacy as he claims for the Protestant E.

*That the reader may have some evidence of the official recognition of our Episcopacy by the English Methodists, I give one out of many similar instances. In the British Minutes for the year 1802, p. 77, is the following entry: "The Rev. John Emory, having been introduced to the Conference as the accredited Representative in our Body of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, presented a letter from that Conference, and gave an interesting and encouraging statement of the prosperity of the work of God in the United States; which account the Conference received with much satisfaction, and unanimously agreed to the following resolutions on the occasion." Here it will be seen that our delegate was introduced to the British Conference, by the Rev. Jabez Bunting, its President, "as the accredited Representative of the General Conference of the *Methodist Episcopal Church* in the United States of America," and the entry made by their Secretary, the Rev. Robert Newton. And by this acknowledgement we are recognized as a part of their body. In the Minutes of their Conference for 1823, p. 49, is the following question and answer: "Question X. Who is appointed the representative to the General Conference of the *Methodist Episcopal Church* of the United States of America, to be held in Baltimore, on the first of May, 1824? Answer, RICHARD REECE." In all their Circulars to us there is the same recognition, being addressed "to the General Superintendents of the *Methodist Episcopal Church*." At the British Conference above referred to the Rev. Mr. Emory, our delegate, was called upon to preach before that body of ministers, and his sermon was published in their magazine. After reading these, and a multitude of similar instances of recognition by the English Methodists, as recorded on their Journals, the public will be prepared to judge of the extent and accuracy of Mr. B's. knowledge of the subject on which he has undertaken to write.

Church, I answer, that having never claimed to possess such an Episcopacy, we, of course, are excused from showing where we obtained it. If he means, as I suppose he does, where did the Methodists in this country obtain the right of ordination? I answer, we obtained it *where God originally placed it, with the people and the body of Presbyters.* From them we received it in "regular order and succession." To which office all true ministers are called, as was St. Paul by the Great and only Head of the Church, in evidence of which souls are miraculously converted as seals of their commission. All which we think, is susceptible of the clearest proof from the Scriptures and ecclesiastical writers of the most distinguished celebrity. We think, too, that an Episcopacy or an Episcopal form of Church Government is perfectly consistent with the admission, that Bishops and Presbyters were primarily and inherently the same order.

Mr. B. thinks "it would be sufficient to show, under ordinary circumstances, that John Wesley never had the Episcopacy"—that is, I suppose he means, never was a *Scriptural* Episcopos; or, in other words, never had a *Scriptural* right to ordain. No doubt this would be enough, either under ordinary, or extraordinary circumstances, for this is the *gist* of the controversy—the very hinge of the whole matter between Methodists and high Churchmen—the true and only proper issue that should be made in investigating our claims; had or had not Mr. Wesley and the Presbyters associated with him a *Scriptural* right to ordain? My only regret is, that having thus approached the *true* issue between us, the Rev. Gentleman did not think that circumstances would warrant a test of his power here. When he shall meet our claims upon this issue he will be considered, at least in settling preliminaries, an honorable disputant. And when he has sustained such an issue, Methodists will admit the invalidity of their ordination; and no doubt seek, without delay, the true sacraments in the succession of Rome. For the Rector must not suppose that by demolishing presbyterial ordination, he will secure the accession of the Methodists to the Protestant Episcopal Church. We claim, that success on such an issue will be death to themselves. By such a stroke he will perform a suicidal act upon his own Church; and this being known to them, full well, the law of self preservation, no doubt, will prevent the pressing of this point. Should this, however, be sustained to our satisfaction, we shall seek the true ordinances of the Gospel, not in the channel of Henry the VIII, but direct from the Seven Hills! Mr. B. thinks the circumstances are so extraordinary, it would not be convenient to abide this his second and true issue. He seems to have written his "examination into the claims of Methodist Episcopacy," without any definite plan, except to make as many hits as possible, and with how much justice he makes them

the reader must decide; hence, the abruptness with which he leaves one position for another, as though he was not conscious of the danger of his situation until he reaches the very brow of the precipice. Discovering, no doubt, both the danger and the labor which his second issue would impose upon him, he proceeds to make up a third, assigning as a reason, that he had "a number of *curious* and *important* documents which he wished to introduce to the notice of the reader." Hence the *importance* of an issue that will *suit* the matter in hand, and give to it not only an appearance of relevancy but a seeming fitness and necessity in its introduction. Verily this, to say the least, is a novel way of investigating claims—very much resembling that of a Clergyman's finding his text after his Sermon is prepared, or a Commentator looking up a book to suit an already written exposition. If I mistake not it will be found not unlike the school-boy, who, finding himself likely to be worsted in an honorable issue, that would truly test the strength of the two parties, leaves the contest in this form, to renew it in the distance with such missiles as may for the time disfigure though not subdue his opponent, and, which, in the end, will bring to the assailant mortification and disgrace.

The third issue made by Mr. B. is thus stated—"we have no *good* and *sufficient* reason to believe, that Mr. John Wesley ever intended to ordain Dr. Coke a Bishop." If he uses the term "Bishop," in the high Church sense, and, by "good and sufficient reason," means such as will satisfy a high Churchman, then he is perfectly safe in this issue; for the reason, that Mr. Wesley never professed to have done such an act. Methodists never claimed, that Mr. Wesley ever *intended* or *pretended* to ordain Dr. Coke or any other man a bishop, in the prelatical sense of the term. It would be the veriest folly for Mr. B. or any one else, to attempt to show, that Mr. Wesley never held nor acted on such an intention. He says, indeed, that though there may be "some evidence" of this, yet it will be made to appear, that there is considerable doubt about their being "good and sufficient reason" to believe, that he ever intended thus to ordain Dr. Coke. Now I venture to go in advance of the Rector, and affirm, that there is *no* evidence that Mr. Wesley either did or intended to do any such thing. This, however, may not be the sense in which Mr. B. wishes to be understood. If he designs to show (as it must be his design, else his position is as ridiculous as can well be conceived,) that there is no good and sufficient reason to believe that Mr. Wesley ever intended to ordain Dr. Coke to the Episcopal office under the name of superintendent, then I join issue with him on this point. Though I would state to the reader that this issue affects in no way the validity of our ordination. So that its final result has no connection with "the claims of

Methodist Episcopacy." Hence a more appropriate title to this portion of Mr. B's work would have been, "the claims of Dr. Coke to an ordination by Mr. Wesley as Superintendent over the American Methodists." If I fail then to shake the "Quod erat demonstrandum" of Mr. Bolles, and it should be clearly and indisputably proved that Dr. Coke came here simply as a presbyter of the Church of England, without any ordination by Mr. Wesley, the subject of our Episcopacy remains untouched. The ordeal which Mr. B. has instituted being designed to test a different matter our ordinations remain unscathed by its fires. This is apparent from the fact, that Mr. Asbury was unanimously chosen by the General Conference, which is the chief Synod of our Church, to exercise Episcopal powers as General Superintendent, and by the unanimous voice of this Synod, or Conference, he was ordained first a Deacon, then an Elder, and then a Superintendent; by Dr. Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, and Richard Whatcoat, and Thomas Vasey—who had been ordained presbyters by Mr. Wesley, Dr. Coke and Mr. Creighton, all presbyters of the English Church, with the assistance of Mr. Otterbine, a presbyter of the German Reformed Church. Mr. Asbury was ordained, then, by four acknowledged presbyters; and claiming, as we do, that presbyters have the right of ordination, we also claim that his consecration was valid; independent of any ordination of Dr. Coke by Mr. Wesley; and in accordance with Archbishop Cranmer, Archbishop Whately, and others, we claim, with these presbyters to have had the right of constituting such an Episcopacy as we have. If Mr. B. thinks differently, let him present the divine law prohibiting or proscribing such an Episcopacy thus established—let him present the edict in express and positive terms; for, till this is done, we shall claim that our ordination is valid. This, then, is seen to be the true question: and I say, again, that I regret the Rev. Gentleman did not confine himself to this point—the true point in the controversy—instead of drawing off the reader to a foreign matter, which, however, clearly, and candidly examined, and decided upon, cannot, in the least, affect the validity of our order. Now, though this issue has no connection with the soundness or unsoundness of our ordination, yet, as I said before, many not understanding the *real* points of difference between Methodist and Protestant Episcopacy, might thereby place a wrong estimate upon Mr. B's reasoning here; and as my object is, to correct the errors and misrepresentations of this work, I shall not hesitate to meet him on any ground which he has chosen.

CHAP. XV

Mr. Bolles' attack upon Methodist Episcopacy, alias, Dr. Coke continued—The affirmative of the question embarrassed by various difficulties; such as—Mr. Wesley's applying to a Greek Bishop for the ordination of Dr. Jones—his peculiar vows as a presbyter of the Church of England—his habit of laying hands on his preachers simply as a token of his blessing—the Conference opposed to adopting the name “Bishop”—Mr. Wesley's rebuke to Mr. Asbury—his loyalty to the King and Parliament—Dr. Coke not received as a Bishop in England—the importance of obtaining information from acknowledged authority.

In joining Mr. Bolles on this issue the question is, “did Mr. Wesley intend to ordain Dr. Coke to the Episcopacy over the American Methodists under the name of Superintendent?” On this question Mr. B. takes the negative, and, as he has attempted to prove, that Mr. Wesley never intended thus to ordain Dr. Coke, I shall examine the testimony and reasoning which he has presented, and adduce such evidence and arguments as have satisfied me that Mr. Wesley not only intended but actually did so ordain Dr. Coke. The question before us is, not whether Mr. Wesley had a *right* to ordain Dr. Coke, but whether he *did* ordain him. Mr. Bolles commences his proof by introducing a variety of difficulties, which he thinks, must seriously embarrass the affirmative of the question, and destroy all ordinary and doubtful testimony that may be adduced. Let us examine these difficulties and see, when analyzed and tried by common sense, how much of a mountain they in reality make.

The first difficulty Mr. B. names, is Mr. Wesley's seeking ordination for Dr. Jones to the office of a Presbyter by a Greek Bishop. He thinks this is such clear evidence that Mr. Wesley did not believe he had himself the *right* of ordination, that it is incredible to suppose that he would afterward attempt to exercise it. Mr. B's difficulty consists, first, in his unwillingness to believe that any prudential motives could have ever influenced the action of Mr. Wesley; and, second, that a high Churchman could ever have changed his views so as to believe that presbyters had the right of ordination; both of which we claim for Mr. Wesley, and which being admitted, annihilate at once the difficulty. For, that it was right to employ the Greek Bishop to ordain Dr. Jones, Mr. Bolles will not deny. Now let us see what embarrassing

circumstances the Rector brings himself into by his construction of Wesley's act. It is well known to all conversant with English history, that Archbishop Parker, through whom Mr. Bolles claims to trace his pedigree to St. Peter, was the first Archbishop of Canterbury under Elizabeth. At his consecration, the Queen issued a warrant for three *Popish* Bishops to ordain him, viz: Tonstal, Bourn, and Pool, but they refusing to act, he was at length consecrated at Lambeth by those who had been *deposed* in the reign of Mary! He was installed December 17th, 1559, and proceeded to ordain such of his brethren as the QUEEN (not Jesus Christ,) appointed to the vacant sees, which vacancies had occurred on account of the papists refusing to take the oath of supremacy to Elizabeth. Nearly seven years after this, such was the excitement that prevailed in reference to the lawfulness of these ordinations, that, to silence all parties, it was brought before the Parliament, and by the two houses confirmed. To say nothing of this strange procedure and its perfect *nullification* of high Church pretensions, as this is not the object of its introduction, I claim if Mr. Wesley's calling upon the Greek Bishop is evidence, that he did not believe he had himself the right of ordination, then it is true that issuing a warrant for three Romish Bishops to consecrate Mr. Parker, is *prima facie* evidence that the Church of England did not believe that the deprived Bishops had a right to ordain. Again, if Mr. Wesley's application to the Greek Bishop for the ordination of Dr. Jones, renders it incredible to suppose that he did subsequently ordain ministers himself, in connection with other presbyters, then it is true that the application of the Church of England to Romish Bishops for the consecration of Mr. Parker, renders it incredible to suppose, that the deprived bishops ever ordained him; and "we have no good and sufficient reason to believe" that Mr. Parker was ever ordained! Such is the difficulty in which Mr. B. involves himself—such the *argumentum ad hominem* of his construction of Mr. Wesley's act—and one might be found urging against him, "can it be that a Church, who so far from believing that she had any authority to ordain that she applied to Romish Bishops to ordain for her—that a Church who considered the hands of *undeprived* bishops so essential to a valid ordination as to issue a warrant for such to officiate—can it be that such a Church would afterward presume with *deprived* Bishops to consecrate an Archbishop, and confer upon him the power of ordaining others? Really, the supposition is incredible; and we must have no ordinary evidence to convince us of the fact. What would he think of such a reasoner? Yet this is the logic of Mr. B. Now it is a matter of plain historical record, that such deprived bishops, with the sanction of that Church, from whom Mr. Bolles derived his orders, did thus ordain; and equally plain is it that Mr.

W did ordain. Now I argue as Mr. B. would in behalf of the English Church, that in both cases the application to foreign administrators was an act of *expediency*, and not resting on a doubt whether they had the *right* to ordain. In the case of Mr. Wesley, we *know* it to be so. This he has settled again and again, as the Rector must know. He declares as to the question of *right* he had no doubt, but, for *peace-sake* he had refrained, and could he have secured the ordination of his preachers elsewhere, so that his people would have been supplied with the sacraments, other than from "Heathenish priests and mitred infidels," he would probably have never ordained any himself. This great difficulty of Mr. Bolles' falls "like the baseless fabric of a vision." Thus we see how easy it is for a man's imagination to run away with his judgment.

Mr. B's remarks about Dr. Jones not being able to read Greek, reminds me of the intelligence of some of the men through whom he professes to have received his own ordination. "The incapacity of these lord bishops was often ludicrous. When Beaumont was made Bishop of Durham, Godwin says, 'he was lame of both feet, and so *illiterate* that he could not *read* the documents of his consecration. The word *metropoliticae* occurring, he hesitated, and being unable to pronounce it, he exclaimed, '*let us skip it and go on.*' So also when he came to the term, *configate*, '*sticking in the mud again,*' says Godwin, he burst out into these words—'By saint Lewis! he was very uncourteous who wrote that word there.' His next successor, but one, in the same see, was Thomas Hatfield. When the pope was reasoned with, that Hatfield was a young, trifling fellow, without either *knowledge*, *gravity*, or *sincerity*, he answered,—'If the King of England (who had requested the pope to consecrate this Hatfield) had asked me to *make an ass a Bishop*, *I would not have refused him!*'"—(Powell, p. 248.) It is well known that many of the clergy in the successional ranks, at the time of their ordination, acknowledged they had never read the canons of their faith, nor the Scriptures, except what they found in their missals; and others could sign a parchment only by making a *MARK*, and some could neither read nor write. With such divines Dr. Jones makes a very honorable contrast; for, that he was a scholar, no one will deny, who has a correct knowledge of the case. He was the head Master of the Free School at Harwich, Curate to Dr. Gibson, the Vicar of that town, whom he succeeded in the Vicarage, the author of a Latin Grammar, a graduate in medicine and arts, a man of great moral worth, and whether he understood the Greek Service at the time of his ordination, or no, should not be an objection in the mind of one, who has received his own orders through a line of prelates, many of whom were consecrated

in infancy, and others were so ignorant as not to be able to read the sheep skin received from their consecrators.

A second difficulty with Mr. B. is, that "Mr. Wesley was an ordained presbyter of the Church of England," and as such, for him to have exercised the right of ordination would have been "a violation of his most solemn ordination vows"—a crime of which he is unwilling to believe Mr. Wesley would be guilty, especially as he professed to be more alive than others to his sacred obligations. Mr. Bolles will not deny that when Mr. Wesley was set apart to the work of a priest, "in the Church of God," he was empowered to do whatever that office in the Church of God imposes. What, then, is the work of a priest in the Church of God? We claim from Scripture, from primitive usage, and as acknowledged by the founders of the English Church, that one of the duties of that office is the work of ordination; and, hence, that Mr. Wesley in performing that act did not transcend the powers, which, as a priest or presbyter in the Church of God, he possessed. If Mr. B. urges that these powers had been taken away from presbyters, or priests, and given by the canons of the English Church exclusively to a higher order of the ministry, then, we claim, he must prove their right of jurisdiction in the premises; for, we argue that no human power can take away that which, by the Head of the Church, has never been brought within the range of human legislation; and if, as Mr. Wesley asserts, he believed himself to be a Scriptural Episcopos, then had he a right to do all the work which the Scriptures assign to that office.

It may be well, here to inquire what is the vow, the violation of which in case ordination was performed, Mr. B. charges upon Mr. Wesley. The question and answer is as follows: "Quest. Will you then give your faithful diligence, always so to minister the doctrine, and the sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your care and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same?" "Ans. I will so do by the help of the Lord." "This vow," as may be seen by turning to Moore's Life of Wesley, p. 136, "contemplates the duties of a Cure, but Mr. Wesley never undertook the Cure of a Parish; and the Bishop who ordained him decided, that he did not in his ordination engage to do so, provided he could as a Churchman better serve God and his Church in his present, or some other station." This should be sufficient to show, that the vow could have been no barrier in the mind of Mr. Wesley, as he came not within its intended range; but, admitting that Mr. Wesley was within the range of this restrictive vow, Mr. B. will

not take the ground, that no circumstances might arise which would render an observance of the vow impracticable, and, thereby, absolve the promiser from its binding force. How, then, will he defend those old reformers who had taken the following, most solemn oath to the Pope: “I. N. Bishop of N. from this hour henceforth, will be *faithful* and *obedient* to blessed St. Peter, and the holy Apostolic Church of Rome, *and to my lord N. the Pope*. I shall be in no council, nor help either with my word or deed, whereby either of them, or any member of them may be impaired, or whereby they may be taken with any evil taking. The council which they shall commit to me either by themselves, or messengers, or by their letters wittingly or willingly, I shall utter to none to their hindrance. To the *retaining and maintaining the Papacy of Rome*, and the regalities of St. Peter, I shall be aided (so mine order be saved) against all persons, &c., *so God help me, and these holy Gospels of God*.”—(*Fox's Acts and Monuments*, Vol. I, p. 259.) And yet, the English Bishops, who had thus most solemnly sworn to their lord, the Pope, to avoid all action that should in any way impair, and to do all that should advance the retaining and maintaining the Papacy of Rome, did conclude, that such was the change of circumstances and relations, that this oath had lost its force, and, that it was right to act against that supremacy, and call this Pope “the Man of Sin”—“the Son of Perdition”—“Anti-Christ,” &c., and to denounce the Church of Rome as “the Great Whore of Babylon.” Will Mr. B., by taking the ground that no circumstances can change the binding nature of a vow, urge against these Reformers the crime of violating their most solemn oaths, and thus admit that his ordination as a *Protestant* Episcopalian had its origin in such sin? If then, these most solemn oaths to the Pope were no barrier to these reformers, why should a vow, which, by the decision of his Bishop, was not designed to reach his case, be a difficulty in the way of Mr. Wesley? If Mr. B. urges, that Mr. Wesley had no right to throw himself back upon those powers secured to presbyters in the New Testament, and, by virtue of rights thus claimed, perform acts not provided for or contemplated by the canons of the Church of England—that all acts performed under such rights, are *ipso facto*, null and void, then, I claim, by the following *argumentum ad hominem*, that his own ordination is null and void according to the canons and usages of the Church of Rome, for the reason that, “Bishops had not the power committed to them, *ex officio*, independent of the Roman See, to ordain other Bishops. Indeed, they *held no independent powers*. All they had received they continued to hold at the Pope's will; and as his deputies. Now, then, when these Bishops were disfranchized by their creator, (for so they called him,) by what authority did they ordain bishops? If our

opponent says, by the authority derived from Scripture, and the usage of the primitive Church; this is just as good an answer for us as it is for him. The Church of Rome constituted the English Bishops; and they, considering themselves *Bishops of the Church of Christ*, assumed the functions which they conceived authorized by Christ, though in direct violation of the restrictions imposed by the Church of Rome: or in the language of our opponent, ‘took on themselves to confer powers, which the Church to which they belonged, and from which they derived all the ecclesiastical powers they had, gave them no right or authority to confer.’ Mr. Wesley was constituted a presbyter of the Church of Christ, and just as the English Bishops had professed to do before him, he flung himself upon the original and paramount authority of Christ, and assumed functions authorized in the New Testament, and by primitive usage; though unsanctioned by the usages of the English Church. The only difference in the two cases is, that the English Bishops were *excommunicated* from the Church of Rome, whereas Mr. Wesley died an *unimpeached* presbyter of the Church of England.”*

Again, “if Mr. Wesley did violate his most solemn obligations to the Church, it was the duty of that Church to call him to an account; and upon failure to give the necessary satisfaction, or suitable pledges of future obedience to her order and discipline, *to disown him, or cut him off from her visible communion.* But this was not done. How then can Mr. Wesley now be convicted of a violation of plighted faith, without at the same time convicting the Church of *winking at his crime*, and so becoming accessory to its terrible guilt? It is to us marvelous, that Church of England men will take so much pains to blacken the character of Mr. Wesley, and yet pretend to do it *for the honor of the Church.* Do they not see that when they shall have proved him an arch schismatic—a monstrous knave—a perjured villain—that, after all, they are obliged to leave him identified with their own Church—*one of its ministers, in good and regular standing?* How do they expect to promote the honor of their Church by proving that

*The pope’s bull, by which Queen Elizabeth and all who held allegiance to her were excommunicated from the Church of Rome, reads as follows—“Moreover we do declare her, (Queen Elizabeth) to be *DEPRIVED* of her *pretended title* to the kingdom, and of all *dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever.* And *ALSO* the *nobility, subjects, and people* of the said kingdom, and of all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be forever *ABSOLVED from any such oath, and all manner of duty* of dominion, *ALLEGIANCE, and obedience;* as we also do, by the authority of these presents, *absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended TITLE to the kingdom, and all other things aforesaid;* and we do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume *NOT TO OBEY HER, or her ministers, mandates, and LAWS;* and those who shall do the contrary, we bind in the same sentence *to be ACCURSED.* Given at Rome, at St. Peter’s, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord 1570.”—(Bull of Pope Pius V.)

she has been so careless of discipline, and the fundamental principles of government, that a most dreadful disorganizer was suffered to rend the Church, and spread most destructive doctrines over the world, without ever being officially condemned, or even tried? This may show great *zeal* for the Church; but certainly it does not display a very considerable amount of *prudence*. Now when [Mr. B.] shall have blackened the character of Mr. Wesley to his hearts content, supposing an infidel should ask him what the character of a Church must be which would tolerate, and suffer to remain within her pale, such a man? What answer could he make? His answer must go to show the very fact of which Mr. Wesley complained, *that there was almost a total prostration of discipline in the Church*. And is [Mr. B.] emulous to prove this fact? One would so suppose from the general tenor of his course in relation to Mr. Wesley and the Methodists." The whole difficulty of Mr. B. is fully explained and Mr. Wesley most triumphantly vindicated from the charge of having violated, by ordaining ministers for his people, "his most solemn vows," by Dr. Elliott in the Meth. Mag. vol. 20, p. 24: where after having shown, that as an *unbeneficed* Clergyman there was no canon, law, nor rubric, that he had violated—that he had committed no offense that came under the cognizance or within the jurisdiction of their ecclesiastical courts thus concludes:—"The state of the matter is plainly this;—the Church of England had no discipline to bear on Mr. Wesley's case, or they had not virtue enough to exercise it, or perhaps both together; or Mr. Wesley attended to the order of the Church with more punctuality than most of her ministers. If they had no discipline to bear on his case, then he could not break their laws, as they did not exist; and they, as a Church, have little claims to Apostolicity, when schismatics, like Wesley and the Methodists, could be permitted to live and die within the pale of the Church without either censure or expulsion. If they had a discipline, but had not vigilance or virtue enough to enforce it, then they are placed in the peculiar dilemma of having allowed, through either indolence or wickedness, the sacred walls of the Church to be broken down; and are not, therefore, the proper successors of Apostles and Primitive Christians. Or if deficiency of discipline, or neglect in exercising it, formed a united barrier in the way, these defects of their's appear in a still more glaring light. And if Mr. Wesley and the Methodists were as good Churchmen as any others, then there can be no room to charge them with schism. The truth is, those of the Clergy and of the people, who had any regard for religion, saw at once, that the spiritual interests of the Church and the world were promoted by the Methodists; and they were not disposed to interfere much with Methodism. The worldly interests of the others were not interfered with by the Methodists; they, there-

fore, generally let them alone, seeing they left them in the quiet possession of their benefices. And add to all this, Mr. Wesley was no ordinary man to meet in controversy or Church process. The sturdiest sons of the Church quailed under the weight of his arguments, and the force of the unction or spirit with which he spoke; and it was more than enough for any of them to meet him, seeing he had scripture, truth, righteousness, antiquity, unremitting industry, and powerful coadjutors on his side. Hence in answer to his brother, in view of his rights as a Churchman, and the father of the Methodist Societies, Mr. Wesley says, 'I firmly believe that I am a scriptural Episcopos as much as any man in England or Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.'" I have dwelt at some length on this point, as it is a favorite one with high Churchmen; and many not fully understanding the facts in the case, have been perplexed with their sophistry. I trust the preceding remarks will convince the reader that this noted difficulty of Mr. B's, when analyzed, is like his succession—nothing more than a FABLE.

A third difficulty with Mr. B. is, that "Mr. Wesley was in the habit of laying his hands upon his preachers in sending them to different parts of the work, as a token of his blessing," and, hence, "the mere imposition of hands" does not prove the ordination of Dr. Coke, but renders it highly probable that "he designed no more than a parting benediction." True, the mere imposition of hands does not prove the ordination of Dr. Coke, or any other man, for many have been validly ordained without any imposition of hands, which is a ceremony of very recent observance among the Wesleyan Methodists in England, and not provable from the scriptures as a necessary accompaniment to a valid ordination. But does Mr. B. intend to say by this what is, most certainly, implied, that in the consecration of Dr. Coke to the Episcopacy or Superintendency of the American Methodists, there was nothing more than the laying on of hands? No meeting of Presbyters called? No formal consecration by prayer? No laying on of the hands of other Presbyters, save those of Mr. Wesley? No regular vouchers executed? No signing of parchment? Yet, these are all well attested historical facts. And when Mr. B. shall present a case in which Mr. Wesley, after much consultation as to the propriety had appointed a meeting for the purpose of *blessing* one of his ministers, and called in three other Presbyters, to assist him in *blessing* him, and, after having gone through with the ceremony of *blessing* him, executed a certificate, certifying to all whom it might concern, that he had thus *blessed* him, and when he shall show, that this act of *blessing* his preacher raised a storm of censure from the high Churchmen of England, who imagined that he had, by this pro-

cedure, transcended his right, and done what exclusively belonged to the Prelate—the work of *blessing* preachers—and his brother Charles became very much displeased with John for thus *blessing* one of his preachers, and rebuked him most severely for such an awful crime! When he has done this, he will present something to the point; but until he does this, the simple reference before us, will be looked upon either, as an exhibition of his folly or trifling with his readers. What? Are we to suppose that Mr. Wesley, after consulting with his preachers about the propriety of furnishing the Methodists in America with ordained ministers, and becoming fully convinced that it was duty—that Providence had called him to the work of consecrating some one to the office of Superintendency over them—and for the consummation of this object called a meeting of Presbyters, and, after setting apart the candidate by prayer and imposition of hands, executed a certificate of ordination, an act which arrayed against him all the high Churchmen of England, who denounced him in their pulpits and periodicals as a schismatic, &c. and heaped upon him all the vile epithets that a fruitful imagination and unbridled tongue could bestow. Is all this to be considered only as a token of his blessing. As a father calls to his side his son, who is about to leave the paternal roof for a distant clime, and laying his hands upon his head, invokes the blessings of Almighty God to rest upon him, so the Rector would have us think, that this was all that Mr. Wesley intended in the consecration of Dr. Coke! Verily, this difficulty of Mr. B. is not merely *fable*; it is quite *SILLY*.*

*I insert here, Dr. Coke's certificate of ordination, executed by Mr. Wesley, which I have altered to suit the idea advanced by Mr. B., that all Mr. Wesley intended was to *bless* the Doctor. The words "set apart," "ordained," "preside," in the original I have omitted, and in their stead have inserted in brackets the words "bless," "blessed," and "blessing."

"To all whom these presents shall come, John Wesley, late fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, presbyter of the Church of England, sendeth greeting:

"Whereas, many of the people in the southern provinces of North America, who desire to continue under my care, and still adhere to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, are greatly distressed for the want of ministers to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the same Church: and, whereas, there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers—

"Know all men, that I, *John Wesley*, think myself to be providentially called at this time to [BLESS] some persons for the work of the ministry in America. And, therefore, under the protection of Almighty God, and with a single eye to his glory, I have this day [BLESSED] as a Superintendent, by the imposition of my hands, and prayer, (being assisted [IN BLESSING] by other [BLESSED] ministers,) Thomas Coke, doctor of civil law; a presbyter of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work. And I do hereby recommend him to all whom it may concern, as a fit person to [BLESS] the flock of Christ. In testimony whereof, I have hereunto

A fourth difficulty of Mr. Bolles, is, that "had Mr. Wesley designed to ordain Dr. Coke a bishop in the Episcopal sense, the preachers would not have opposed his taking that name." By "Episcopal sense," I suppose he means high Church sense—bishops as a third order by divine right, distinct from, and superior to presbyters. In this sense we have already said Mr. Wesley did not intend to ordain him. And why should Mr. B. seek to multiply difficulties by changing the issue. It is a matter known to him, full well, that the Methodists never claimed to have bishops in that sense. It was also known to him, that when the preachers understood each other as to the sense in which the name was to be used, in its scriptural and not in that sense which obtained after the corruption of christianity, they voted in favor of its adoption in the place of Superintendent. Why then, is not this distinction constantly observed unless Mr. B. wishes to embarrass and perplex the reader? What he says about the Conference "not approving" but "acceding" to the change of the name, is difficult to be understood, at least, it is difficult for me to understand, how a Conference could accede, as a body, to this or any change, and, as a body not say they approved of it. He was then writing of our Conference action, and says, as a conference, we did not approve, yet as a Conference we acceded to it; that is, it voted in favor, and yet, was not in favor. How does Mr. B. know, whether they were in favor or not but by the *vote* of the Conference? And that vote, by his own admission, was in favor of the change. How will he reconcile this admission with his assertion, that the Conference disapproved it? And how will he reconcile this assertion with the following, which by the sanction of that body, was inserted in their Minutes, "we have constituted ourselves into an *Episcopal Church*, under the direction of *Bishops, elders, deacons, and preachers*, according to the form of ordination annexed to our prayer book, and the regulations laid down in this form of *Discipline*." Instead of the question, "Who are the *Superintendents*," &c.? We have in the Minutes, "Who are the *Bishops* for our Church in the United States?" And the answer is Thomas Coke, Francis Asbury." With this open avowal upon the records of the adoption of the name of Bishop in the place of Superintendent, is it

set my hand and seal, this second day of September, in the year of our Lord
one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four.

JOHN WESLEY."

Will any man in his senses, with an ordinary amount of intellect, believe, that Mr. Wesley designed all this as nothing more than *a token of his blessing*? And the same transformation might, and according to Mr. B. should, be extended to all the other parchments he executed for those whom he ordained. How great the darkness that must have rested upon the minds of Mr. Wesley's high Church enemies! And what a great pity that this Western Luminary did not shine in the Eastern Hemisphere in 1784.

honorable—is it honest, to say, that the Conference did not approve of this change? Whose testimony shall be received, the official documents of our Church, or the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Bolles?

A fifth difficulty of Mr. B's is, that Mr. Wesley rebuked Mr. Asbury for adopting the name "Bishop" in the place of "Superintendent." He argues, had Mr. Wesley been in favor of his exercising the office he would not have been opposed to the adoption of the name. All Mr. B's ridicule of the construction which Methodists put upon this rebuke, and all his questions, which he thinks "reflecting people will ask," so far from convincing, have rather served to strengthen me in the belief that their construction is the true one; and it is very strange to me, that any one reading Mr. Wesley's letter to Mr. Asbury, can make any other construction of it, unless they have an end to serve. Take, for instance, this passage, "But in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid both the Doctor and you differ from me. I study to be *little*, you to be *great*; I *creep*, you *strut* along. I found a *school*, you a *college*." How could language more clearly express, that what he referred to, was "pomp and ceremony." Surely Mr. B. will not take the ground that Mr. Wesley was opposed to *education*: for to promote this he labored arduously, and the school which he established at Kingswood is now a standing monument of the deep interest he took in this cause; and had he known more of an *American College* he would never have rebuked the Methodists here for attaching this title to their School. He associated with the name college the "pomp and ceremony" of an eastern College, and hence, preferred the more modest title of school. If this was his meaning in his reference to a college, by what rule will Mr. Bolles deny the same construction in his reference to the term Bishop? If in the former instance he was not opposed to the promotion of *education*, by the American Methodists, so I argue in the latter reference, he was not opposed to their Superintendent performing the *work* of a *Bishop*—of discharging all the duties of a scriptural *episcopos*—that in both, and all cases, he was opposed, as his whole life shows, to "pomp and ceremony." This, I conceive to be the only consistent exposition of his letter. Knowing the display connected with an English College and an English Bishop, he preferred the more humble names of School and Superintendent. This is so plain, that I say, again, it seems difficult to reconcile a different construction with honest intention. If the intention has been honest, it furnishes a most striking illustration of the blinding power of prejudice. Reflecting minds will ask, upon Mr. B's construction, some such questions as these: If Mr. Wesley was opposed to *education* why did he found a school for its promotion? If he was opposed to Messrs. Coke and Asbury exercising jurisdiction over the *American*

Methodists by ordaining their preachers, &c., why did he set apart the former and recommend the latter to *this* work? And when these gentlemen performed this work, according to his instructions and the sanction of the conference, why, if he was displeased with the *thing*, did he not make some complaint? If Mr. Wesley was displeased with the *office*, instead of the *name*, then, when he changed the term "Priest" for "Elder" does it not follow that he was opposed to the office of a Priest? Why, then, when his Elders performed the work of a Priest in administering the sacraments—a work which the letters he gave assigned to them—why did he not utter his displeasure to *their* assumption? Until Mr. Bolles shall furnish some instance where Mr. Wesley complained of the American Methodists, because they were promoting the cause of education in the establishment of a School—of their Elders, because they administered the sacraments to the people—of their Superintendents, or Bishops, because they ordained preachers, and exercised jurisdiction as *overseers*, his construction of this letter will be regarded by all, except "the credulous, as curious and laughable indeed." It is a matter of indisputable record, that, as Superintendents, Messrs. Coke and Asbury held and exercised by and with the sanction and appointment of Mr. Wesley and the General Conference, jurisdiction over Presbyters and Deacons—that a change of name, did not change the *thing*, for they neither possessed nor exercised Episcopal prerogatives under the latter, that were not held under the former name. Mr. Bolles will not deny but that there can be a change of name without a change of the thing? How, then, will he justify his own Bishop White in saying, "but it will be also said, that the very name of 'Bishop' is offensive: if so, change it for another; let the *superior Clergyman* be a *President*, a *Superintendent*, or in plain English, and according to the literal translation of the original, an *Overseer*. However, if *names* are to be reprobated, because the powers annexed to them are abused, there are few appropriated to either civil or ecclesiastical distinctions which would retain their places in our Catalogue."—(*The case of the Episcopal Churches Considered*, p. 17.) Surely the good Bishop White did not think that his President, Superintendent or Overseer, would be any the less a Bishop by adopting either of those names? Nor would Mr. B. admit that his recommending such a change was evidence, that Bishop White was opposed to the *office* of a Bishop? Neither do we admit, that Mr. Wesley believed that Messrs. Coke and Asbury were less or more Overseers or Presidents under the name of Bishop than they were when called Superintendents—their powers and duties remaining the same. And, hence, conclude that his opposition to the name of Bishop, was an opposition to a *name*, and not to an *office*. Indeed, no one is laid under the necessity

of addressing them by the title of Bishop; some do not, but continue to use the name of Superintendent. All are at liberty, in this, to be governed by their own wishes. The construction of this letter to Mr. Asbury as understood by our English Methodists may not be unwelcome to the reader. Mr. Moore, the friend and biographer of Mr. Wesley, who gave publicity to this letter, and whose biography was adopted by the Conference, and, hence may be quoted as the expression of their views and sentiments, says, "Mr. Wesley well knew the difference between the *office* and the *title*. He knew and felt the arduous duties and high responsibility which attach to the one, and the comparative nothingness of the other." "He gave to those Episcopoi—(Bishops) whom he ordained, the modest, but highly expressive title of *Superintendents*, and desired that no other might be used." "His objection to the title, 'Bishop,' arose from his hatred of all *display*." "The association in his mind between the assumed *title* and the *display* connected with it in the latter ages of the Church," continues Mr. Moore, was so strong "he could not at that moment separate the plain, laborious Bishops of the American Societies, where there is no legal establishment, from the dignified Prelates of the mighty Empire of Great Britain." Similar views might be given from other *standard* works; but this will be sufficient to show, that this is the acknowledged construction of those who knew Mr. Wesley *best*—the authorized construction of our Church.

It is well known, that in different Churches many ministers have been opposed to the practice of addressing Clergymen by the title "Rev." as savoring more of *pride* than piety; and some have thought that it was *impious*, as the title is given to Jehovah—"Holy and Reverend is his name." Must we conclude, as the logic of Mr. Bolles teaches, that all those ministers were opposed to the *office* of the Christian Ministry? Many Clergymen, eminent for science and piety, have thought it inconsistent with the teaching of the Saviour to his Apostles about being called Rabbi, to consent to have the titles, A. M., D.D., &c. appended to their names. Is this evidence, that all such ministers are opposed to a Clergyman having that *knowledge* of Science and Theology which those titles indicate? And yet, upon Mr. B's rule of construction, this must be the conclusion. Now, as Mr. Wesley never complained of the power exercised, or the work performed by Messrs. Coke and Asbury under either of their titles—as he changed the name Priest for Elder without changing the work assigned to the Priest—as he opposed the name of College, while he gave most satisfactory evidence of his great desire to promote education, and as the rule of Mr. B. would lead to almost endless absurdities, I conclude, that the construction of Mr. Wesley's own biographer—the construction which the Method-

ists generally, both in England and America, have put upon this letter to Mr. Asbury, is the correct construction, and that no one would have presumed to have construed it differently, but to serve a party. Hence, Mr. Bolles' fifth difficulty is found purely imaginary—based upon an incorrect and unwarranted rule of construction.

There are other remarks made by Mr. B. on this item of his difficulties which can accord with honest intention only upon the ground of inexcusable ignorance. For a man to write upon Methodist Episcopacy and say as Mr. Bolles has that Mr. Wesley never believed himself to be a Bishop, and that "the assumption of this *office*" by Messrs. Coke and Asbury, "brought down his gray hairs in sorrow to the grave," is so utterly foreign from the facts in the case that it is difficult to reconcile such statements with "common heathen honesty." Did not Mr. Wesley say he believed himself a Bishop? Are not these his words? "I firmly believe, that I am a Scriptural Episcopos as much as any man in England or Europe." Did he not write congratulatory letters to Mr. Asbury on the success of the work here, without a word of censure or of admonition? True it is, that Mr. Asbury, was too good not to have enemies, and enemies who so abused the ear of Mr. Wesley, situated as he was 3000 miles from him, that by their misrepresentations he became biased against him and feared that the Methodists here were departing from the simplicity of the Gospel, and under the influence of such sentiments wrote a rebuke which facts would not have warranted, but which Mr. Asbury received with the meekness of a Christian—the meekness of conscious innocence—Mr. Wesley lived long enough to see his error, and when he became more fully acquainted with the humility, the stedfastness, the prosperity of American Methodists, he was satisfied that we had the divine approval, and died, not as Mr. Bolles says with notes of sorrow because our Superintendents were called Bishops! But with notes of Christian triumph, shouting with his expiring breath, "THE BEST OF ALL IS, GOD IS WITH US."

A sixth difficulty in the way of Mr. B's believing that Mr. Wesley intended to ordain Dr. Coke to the Episcopacy over the American Methodists, is his loyalty to the King and Parliament. He assumes, that such an ordination, as we claim for Dr. Coke by Mr. Wesley, would have been a violation of the law of the King and of the Parliament. That such an ordination would have been an unquestionable violation of an express statute of the Realm is a mere assumption of Mr. B. unaccompanied with proof, and his assuming the fact, unsupported by evidence, renders his difficulty unworthy of consideration. When he shall give the law in the case, prohibiting, "under pains and penalties," the ordination of a Presbyter, by Presbyters within the British Em-

pire to the office of Superintendent or Overseer of a religious community residing in another country, and shall show, that such a statute was in full force at the time we claim Dr. Coke was thus ordained, then his difficulty will be worthy of consideration; but until this is done, "thinking minds" will look upon his sixth difficulty as a baseless fabric—an attempt to embarrass a case where no real embarrassment exists. For we affirm, that by ordaining Dr. Coke Superintendent Mr. Wesley committed no political or ecclesiastical offence that came within the cognizance of any statute then in force. Mr. B. will not deny that it was generally believed in England, both by the friends and enemies of Mr. Wesley, that he had thus ordained Dr. Coke, hence the wit, railery, bitter persecution, and obloquy that were thrown upon him by the high Church party. "Thinking men" will ask, if it was plain, that Mr. Wesley by such a consecration had violated the law of the land, why was not some legal process instituted against him? Are these true successors of the Apostles so lenient that they not only permit men to be ordained as ministers, irrespective of creed or character, but wink at such a fearful inroad upon their exclusive prerogatives, and that too when the arm of civil law is on their side, by which these schismatics could be arrested in their course? The history of that day most clearly shows, that they were not indifferent beholders of these inroads and irregularities. The scurrilous articles in their periodicals, the mobs headed by the succession priest, reeling under the influence of alcohol, armed with clubs, rotten eggs, brick-bats, and all the paraphernalia of a drunken rabble, show how deeply they felt upon the subject. Are we to conclude, that these depositaries of Apostolic power—these regular descendants of St. Peter, were so low and grovelling, so debased and abominable, that they preferred mob law to English law? For the honor of their cause, and their priesthood, we prefer to conclude, that had there been in the case of Mr. Wesley an obvious violation of statute law, these men would have sought to punish him by legal process—would have executed, to the very letter, the law of the land; and that their resort to *savage, brute* law, where might is right, was, because it offered the only means of redress—that these Apostolic prelates arraigned Mr. Wesley (sometimes on the Sabbath) before Judge Lynch because no English Judge had legal jurisdiction in the premises.

"Mr. Wesley was a Monarchist," says Mr. Bolles, that is, he was in favor of the government under which he lived. Was this a crime? Were not the English Prelates, "His Grace and Most Reverend Father in God by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan and Primate of all England" from whom the Rector claims to have received in regular succession, the right to preach the Gospel in all the world, except the British

Empire, a Monarchist? Rather does not the life of his credentials centre in the King of England, as the source from whence the Episcopacy of his Church received its being, at least the source where it received the *right* to live, and, according to Mr. B's own admission, without the act of the King, Protestant Episcopacy in its present form, would never have blessed this land. His Church, then, is the acknowledged child of Monarchy. Whether he is the proper person to bring the charge of toryism against the Methodists, who claim no such Royal affinity, the reader must judge. It is not strange that Mr. Wesley, living as he did all his days under a Monarchical Government, should be opposed to Republicanism, and seek to justify the acts of his King and country in retaining possession of these colonies, but whoever will read his "Calm Address to the Americans," *entire*, will find that Mr. Bolles in his allusions and extracts here, is the copyist of his tract man, and comes far short of giving *fully* or *fairly* the true designs of that paper. Mr. Wesley wrote it as a Peace-man for the purpose of allaying excitement, and, if possible, to prevent war and blood-shed between us and our Mother Country. And believing that the acts of his King and Parliament had been misrepresented to the American people, he explained those acts, and gave the reasons of their passage. Whatever truth or error his Address may contain, I shall not attempt to decide. I only claim, that its design was worthy of a minister of the "Prince of Peace"—of Him who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. Mr. Wesley was a Monarchist. Yes, and he was *once* a high Churchman! And who does not know, that the divine right of Kings and the divine right of Bishops are twin sisters, and always go hand in hand. But Mr. Wesley lived long enough, and read enough, to have the former error corrected; and having renounced the divine right of Bishops as a *fable*, which no man ever did or could prove, he was prepared soon to acknowledge the hand of God in so strangely making us free. And Mr. Bolles should not think it strange, as he has taken the counter-march to Mr. Wesley, and from a low has become an exceedingly high Churchman, if *his* loyalty to Republicanism should soon be called in question. Nor shall I deem it marvelous if he is found advocating the divine right of Kings and urging the necessity of having a Monarch as Head of "THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA." Mr. Wesley was a Monarchist. Yes, but he was a Christian! And as such, was loyal to his King and Parliament in all those things which were not in his way of doing good; but when civil or ecclesiastical enactments were barriers to his usefulness to the souls and bodies of men, the motto of his life was, "*actum est*" [it is done.] "The cause of my God first, that of my King and Country next!" This difficulty then is as groundless as the preceding.

A seventh difficulty of Mr. Bolles' in the way of his believing that Mr. Wesley ever intended to ordain Dr. Coke a Superintendent over the American Methodists, is, his not being received as a Bishop on his return to England. This difficulty is among the last I should expect would be urged by a minister of the Protestant E. Church—a minister who holds his commission under a law that interdicts all *his* Prelates from exercising their Episcopate in England; for, though the commission Christ gave to his Apostles was “*Go into ALL THE WORLD, and preach the Gospel to EVERY CREATURE,*” the act of King George III. and his Parliament, by which his Archbishops were authorized to ordain Bishops for America, makes all commissions executed by the authority of such act null and void, while the holder of them is within the widely extended dominion of Great Britain—the jurisdiction of the sceptre, of that *Layman* from whom they emanated. The act reads, “*no person, or persons consecrated to the office of a Bishop, in the manner aforesaid, nor any person or persons DERIVING THEIR CONSECRATION from or under any Bishop so CONSECRATED, nor any person or persons admitted to the order of a Deacon or Priest by any Bishop or Bishops so consecrated, OR BY THE SUCCESSOR OR SUCCESSORS OF ANY BISHOP OR BISHOPS so consecrated, SHALL BE THEREBY ENABLED TO EXERCISE their office or offices WITHIN HIS MAJESTY's DOMINIONS.*”—(*An act to empower, &c.*) Therefore, whenever any of these American Prelates, Priests or Deacons visit England, they are bound, by the terms of that covenant on which they received ordination, to leave their *robes* and their *office* behind them. Says Dr. Fisk, on this point, “*the Church of England is, in fact, a little more exclusive than Popery, for although the Episcopacy of the Protestant E. Church in the United States was derived from the English, the latter, nevertheless, exclude the former from their pulpits; even an American Bishop is not allowed to preach in the most obscure Parish Church in England.*”—(*Travels in Europe*, p. 577.) Suppose then, to apply this argumentum ad hominem, that Messrs. Provost, White, and Madison, or either of them, after having received their consecration in England, had been pleased to visit that land again, and that upon some Clergyman in this country hearing that they were not received there, in their Episcopal character, by their consecrators, should set up the plea that they never had been consecrated, that although the Bishops of England might have laid hands upon them and executed parchments of consecration, what does this prove when we have the evidence that on their return they are addressed and treated, not as Bishops, but as *Laymen*, or perhaps, at some of their conventions appointed “*Secretary*”? Is not this most satisfactory evidence that their consecration was never intended to be an ordination, but simply the *blessing* of their consecrators? What would Mr.

Bolles say of such arguments? Why, I should expect he would say, their author betrayed ignorance of the facts in the case. He would say, is it not well known that they were consecrated as Bishops of the Church of God in America, not in England, hence, their not being recognized as Bishops there is no evidence that their consecrators did not design to ordain them Bishops? So I argue in the case of Dr. Coke; he was ordained a Superintendent or Bishop over the *American* Methodists, not the Methodists in England, and for the Rector to urge, because he was not received or treated as Superintendent in England, as evidence that Mr. Wesley never ordained him a Superintendent, is to expose his ignorance of the facts in the case. Says Mr. Watson, in his life of Wesley, p. 248, "Dr. Coke was only an occasional visitant in America, and though in the sense of *office* he was a Bishop there, when he returned home, as here he had no such office, so he used no such title, and made no such pretensions." His consecration by Mr. Wesley and the Presbyters associated with him, did not, nor was it designed to invest him with Episcopal powers in England. *There*, he was simply a *Presbyter* of the Church of England, and a preacher in the Wesleyan connexion, and as such, it was nothing strange or improper that he should fill the office and perform the duties of a Secretary of their Conference. This seventh difficulty of Mr. Bolles' has vanished, and lo! where is it?

In what Mr. B's eighth, and last difficulty consists it is no easy matter to understand. True, he says something about "the exercise of certain Episcopal *duties*" (*powers* I suppose he means) the consecration of Alexander Mather, and the setting apart of ministers to minister in Scotland, but how he links these on to the case of Dr. Coke's ordination I am not able to perceive. No doubt, however, it is clear to his mind; for a man who can tie up the broken chain of Prelatical succession so as to present an uninterrupted series from St. Peter to the present incumbent of this Diocese, would find no difficulty in such a matter as the one before us. What Mr. Bolles says of the setting apart of John Pawson, Thomas Handy, and Joseph Taylor to minister in Scotland, being only the sending of them to a field of labor, will have no influence upon minds that have any knowledge of the facts in the case, other than to convince them, that the Rector is ~~too~~ deficient in either knowledge or honesty to write upon the subject he has taken in hand. His inquiries after the records of ordination in the case of Mather, reminds me of the entries, which after all their research into the past, high Churchmen are obliged to make on their successional tables, upon the genuineness of which depend, according to their hypothesis, not only the validity of their orders, but the salvation of their people. Yet even there, where from the claim urged we might expect to find every

thing plain and satisfactory, the inquirer is constantly perplexed with doubts, inspired by meeting with the entry, "no record"—"no record"—"no record." Names to be sure are duly inserted, but should I propose the inquiry to the Rector, by what authority are a large portion of those names inserted? The only response he could make would be, "no record." Did we place as much dependence as the high Churchman upon the perfection of these records, we should, no doubt, see that they were duly made up and carefully preserved—the absence of which on the succession Tables, is most conclusive evidence, that our ancestors in the Church placed a very different estimate upon the value of *genealogy* than some of their pharisaical descendants of the present day.

I have now examined, and, I trust, satisfactorily disposed of, the mountain of difficulties reared by Mr. Bolles as a barrier in the way of believing that Mr. Wesley ever designed to ordain Dr. Coke to the Episcopacy over the American Methodists. This mountain upon approaching it, is found to be purely fictitious. The Rector's "bump" of ideality must have been marvelously developed and highly excited in its action. One is at a loss how to account for the course which he has adopted in this examination. Did Mr. Bolles wish to embarrass the case by introducing matter irrelevant? What has a large portion of that which has been considered to do with the ordination of Dr. Coke? Did he wish to gratify a bitter spirit by seizing upon this occasion to fasten odium upon Methodism? I will not charge this upon Mr. B. though it seems, in an under current, to extend through his entire work, and it is difficult to account for the introduction of so many things perfectly foreign to the case, just at the entrance of the investigation, unless upon the ground that he wished to disgust the reader before he entered the edifice—to bias the mind, and unfit it for an impartial weighing of the evidence that might be introduced. Be this as it may, of one thing I think the reader will be convinced, and that is, if a writer upon Methodist Episcopacy wishes to save himself from the disgrace of being considered either an ignorant or dishonorable disputant, instead of drawing his materials from such men as Nott, Hampson, Lavington, Warburton, Whitehead, Southey, Sidney, A. McCaine, a *nameless* Farmer, and others of the same school, he should at least, partially, acquaint himself with the standard and acknowledged authorities of the Church he seeks to annihilate. Which of these palms, ignorance or dishonesty, is due Mr. B., or whether he is worthy of both the reader must judge. If, however, he feels in doubt how to decide, these doubts will be dissipated by a perusal of the next chapter.

CHAP XVI.

Mr. Bolles' attack upon Methodist Episcopacy, alias, Dr. Coke continued—his direct and positive testimony—Dr. Whitehead—the opinion of English Methodists at the time—Mr. Charles Wesley—Southey's Life of Wesley—credentials of Dr. Coke—his Certificate of Ordination—Mr. Wesley's Circular to the brethren in North America.

We now come to Mr. Bolles' direct and positive testimony, by which he seeks to prove, that Mr. Wesley never designed to ordain Dr. Coke to the Episcopacy over the American Methodists, under the name of Superintendent. From the light which his preceding statements shed upon the case, he imagines this branch of the subject will be approached by the reader under very auspicious circumstances. No doubt he designed it should be so approached, but if I mistake not, the greater number of what he terms facts, have been shown to be what might be called opaque facts, and bear the same relation to his subject that Israel's pillar bore to the Egyptian Monarch, darkness instead of light! And if not as disastrous in its results, will, I think, be somewhat embarrassing.

The first witness called to the stand, by Mr. B. is, Dr. Whitehead. This is not only his first and principal witness, but Lawyer also, for to testimony, he adds special pleading. This witness, being so important, is introduced with many laudatory remarks. He was, says Mr. B., "the author of the first published, and the most authentic and valuable Memoir of Mr. Wesley—his most intimate and confidential friend, who was with him in his last moments and preached his funeral sermon—who was requested immediately after by the English Conference to write his life, and was one of the individuals to whom Mr. Wesley left his manuscripts by will." A greater number of mistakes could not have been written in the same space. Mr. Bolles, when he wrote these sentiments, knew, if he ever read the book he professes to quote, that Dr. Whitehead's Life of Wesley was not the *first* published life of that venerable man! That so far from being the *most authentic* and *valuable* memoir of him, it has, with our Church, which ought to know the facts in the case, ever been valueless and of *no authority*—valuable only to our enemies—that though at one time he was highly esteemed by Mr. Wesley, he was *far* from being his *most intimate and confidential friend*,

and his not being received as such was probably the primary cause of his downfall and ultimate excision from the Church—that though he preached a funeral sermon on the death of Mr. Wesley, as others did, there is no reason for calling it *the* funeral sermon—that though he was requested by the Conference with two assistants, to write the Life of Mr. Wesley, and that to these three Mr. Wesley had left his manuscripts by Will. It is also true that he proved himself unworthy of the trust and confidence reposed in him—that the Memoir he wrote was never received by the Conference, but the other two gentlemen, Messrs. Coke and Moore, were appointed to write his life independent of Mr. Whitehead, and *their* work being adopted by the Conference, is the work which should be used as authority. Nevertheless Mr. B. makes no allusion to this, and perhaps, has never heard of it, being well satisfied with the testimony of our enemies. That the reader may have the facts in the case I will offer a few quotations from an authentic work. "His manuscripts he" [Mr. Wesley] "bequeathed to Dr. Coke, Dr. Whitehead, and Mr. Henry Moore." "Two of these gentlemen, viz. Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, were absent from London, and fully engaged in the work of Itinerants. Dr. Whitehead resided in London, and at that time acted as a local preacher, under the direction of Mr. Rogers, the Superintendent. This gentleman had also been a travelling preacher for some years. He afterwards studied physic and joined the society of Quakers. About three years before Mr. Wesley's death, he again joined the Methodist Society, and was received by Mr. Wesley with his usual kindness. He was much esteemed by all the parties, and was, therefore, with the consent of all, appointed to compile the 'Narrative:' Mr. Wesley's papers, at the Doctor's earnest request, were also delivered into his care by Mr. Rogers, with the consent of Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore, that he might select, at his leisure, what was needful for the work; the whole to be afterwards examined. Dr. Whitehead proposed to Mr. Rogers, that he should have one hundred pounds for his trouble and loss of time, which was fully agreed to at a meeting of the executors and the printing Committee united; only they determined, at the request of Mr. Rogers, that the Doctor should have one hundred guineas, as being a handsomer sum." "Dr. Whitehead, however, soon after the Conference, to the astonishment of all concerned, declared his intention of publishing the Life as an *independent man*. He also declared, that he would make such use of the manuscripts of Mr. Wesley, with which he had been entrusted, as he *himself*, should think proper, and that he would not suffer them to be examined as Mr. Wesley had ordered in his will, previous to the publication, unless the two other trustees of these manuscripts would enter into an engagement, that he should retain in his hands, all

those papers, which *he* should judge to be necessary for the work. He insisted also, that the copy-right of the book should belong to him, and that if it should be published from the book-room, he would have half the clear profits.

“As the Doctor had engaged (see p. 196,) to compile the Life for the Book-room, (i. e. for the charity to which Mr. Wesley had bequeathed all his literary property,) the committee expostulated with him on his unfaithfulness, and the extravagance of his new demands. Their expostulations were, however, in vain. They had acted with great simplicity towards the Doctor. Having a high opinion of his integrity, and attachment to the cause in which they were all engaged, they had given all the necessary materials into his hands, and so were completely in his power. He was fully sensible of this advantage, and persevered in those demands, with which he knew the committee could not comply. This strange conduct occasioned great uneasiness, not only in the London Society, but throughout the whole connexion.

“When this uneasiness was at a considerable height, the seven trustees of Mr. Wesley’s Testamentary Deed went to London, to take out letters of administration. Being informed of the dispute, they united their efforts with those of the committee to make peace, and, in order thereto, they determined to sacrifice a considerable part of the income of the charity. Accordingly, they consented to give Dr. Whitehead one half of the clear profits of the book for two years, provided the manuscript should be approved by the committee appointed to superintend the printing. To the first of these proposals the Doctor agreed, but he absolutely refused to comply with the latter: and as nothing great or small, could be printed without such approbation, (which the Doctor well knew,) the trustees were obliged, at length, after some fruitless expostulation, to leave the Doctor to his own way.

“A life of Mr. Wesley had, however, been advertised from the book-room, and the Connexion expected it. The trustees, therefore, in conjunction with the committee, appointed the two other trustees of Mr. Wesley’s manuscripts, to compile a Life, according to the first intention. The work was accordingly undertaken and completed, without any profit or emolument whatsoever to the parties. The whole edition, consisting of ten thousand copies, was sold in a few weeks, and a second edition published when the conference assembled.

“Dr. Whitehead was, by this time, not quite so sanguine concerning the memoirs which he was writing, as when he rejected the proposals of the committee. He addressed the Conference, and complained of the ill treatment which, he said, he had received. The Conference answered, that before they could listen to any complaint from him, he must consent to an examination of Mr. Wesley’s papers, according to his Will, as he could not

appear before them as an upright man, till he should do so. They declared that if he would consent to this, they would gladly hear any thing which he had to say in his own defense, or any accusation which he should bring against any members of their body who had opposed him.

“ This reply produced the proposals, which the Doctor has printed in the advertisement prefixed to his memoirs. They consist of three parts. In the first, the Doctor proposes an examination of the manuscripts. In the second, that the Conference should take his Life of Mr. Wesley, (of which there was at that time 128 pages printed,) off his hands, upon the conditions therein mentioned. And in the third, that he should be restored to his place as a Local Preacher. As the Conference could not suppose that Dr. Whitehead had any serious expectation, that they would have any thing to do with the Life of their honored Father which he was writing; and as his restoration as a Preacher most depend (as long as any upright discipline should remain) upon his faithfully acting according to Mr. Wesley’s Will, as a trustee of his papers; the Conference, in considering the Doctor’s proposals, in the first instance only attended to *that* particular. The following was the Doctor’s final proposal upon this leading point:—

“ ‘ All the manuscripts of Mr. Wesley shall be *fairly* and *impartially* examined, by Dr. Coke, Mr. Moore, and Dr. Whitehead. Such papers as they shall unanimously deem unfit for publication, shall be burned immediately. Out of the remainder, Dr. Whitehead shall be at liberty to select such as he thinks necessary for his work; and the remainder to be given into the hands of Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore.’ Such was the Doctors proposal, even in this stage of the business; after many declarations, that he was willing, and had often proposed, to enter into an examination of Mr. Wesley’s papers, at length it fully appeared what kind of an examination he would consent to, viz. that his single negative should preserve any paper from destruction; and his single affirmative enable him to use any paper, in such a way as he himself should think proper. As there could be no hesitation, among upright men, upon such a proposal as this, a reply was immediately sent, signed by the President and Secretary, pointing out the injustice and total want of ingenuousness, as well as the unfaithfulness to the deceased, which was manifest in the proposal respecting the examination of the manuscripts; and again declaring, in substance, that while he refused to fulfil his duty uprightly, as a trustee of Mr. Wesley’s papers, they could have nothing to do with him in any other character. To this the Conference received no answer. The Conference were thus obliged, as the committee had been before, to leave the Doctor to pursue his own way, contenting themselves with bearing their testimony against an evil which they could not prevent.”—(*Myles’ Hist. of the Methodists’ Con. Edition*, p.p. 195-215.)

Such is the character of the man, and such the character of his work, which Mr. B. introduces as "the author of the first published, and the most authentic and valuable memoir of Mr. Wesley; his most intimate and confidential friend," to prove and argue his cause, from whom he draws the principal part of his material to show that Dr. Coke, Mr. Wesley, and those associated with them, were a set of impostors without truth or shame: and, surely, no one will doubt that from such a source the Rev. Gentleman can draw all the materials necessary to blacken, to his hearts content, the characters of these servants of God. What must we think of the man who will use such material? Now as Mr. B. refers to the work I have now quoted, it is reasonable to conclude, that he had before him all of these facts. What opinion must we form of a man who professes to examine a subject impartially and introduces such a witness, withholding all the facts which we have presented? What must we think of the honesty of the advocate or the cause which requires a resort to such weapons?

The reader will now be prepared to determine, what influence the testimony and arguments of such a witness should have and what amount of candor is due the Rector. But what is the sum of the Doctor's testimony? Not his vituperations, his bitter sayings, his invectives. These I shall not reply to. If Mr. Bolles has allowed his witness to use slanderous and abusive epithets, and to give utterance to a thousand things foreign to the case, upon him the odium must rest. Whether this was his object or not in introducing him, will appear by examining his evidence, as it bears upon the question. Dr. Whitehead was introduced by Mr. B., professedly, to prove that Mr. Wesley never intended to ordain Dr. Coke. What is the language of the witness upon this question? He says, (I quote from the testimony Mr. B. has extracted,) at the Conference in Leeds, 1784, it was proposed "that Mr. Wesley should *ordain* one or two preachers for the Societies in America." "Mr. Wesley well knew that no Bishop would *ordain* them at *his* recommendation, and *therefore* seemed inclined to *do it himself*." "Mr. Wesley came to Bristol, and, Sept. 1, every thing being prepared as proposed above, he complied with the Doctor's [Coke] earnest wish, by *consecrating* him one of the *BISHOPS* of the New Methodist Episcopal Church in America." Such is the testimony of Mr. B.'s principal witness—a witness that he introduced with so many laudatory remarks. This witness declares, unequivocally, that Mr. Wesley did consecrate Dr. Coke a Bishop. Shall we believe Mr. B.'s witness? Then our work is done—the affirmative of the question is sustained. Was it for such testimony that Mr. Bolles introduced Dr. Whitehead, or for the abusive language upon Mr. Wesley and Dr. Coke that accompanied this testimony? On this point no one can be at a loss how to decide.

We pass to Mr. B's second class of testimony, "the opinions of the English Methodists at the time" as to the fact whether Mr. Wesley did *intend* to ordain Dr. Coke. Whether Mr. Wesley did or did not, depart from his former opinions and practice, is not the question. Did he ordain Dr. Coke? Is the point to settle. On this point Dr. Whitehead, who is still both advocate and witness, is quoted, and he introduces extracts from two letters, said to have been written by two Methodist preachers, whose names are not given. The extracts are as follows: "*Ordination* among the Methodists! Amazing indeed! I could not force myself to credit the report which spread here, having not then seen the minutes, but now I can doubt it no longer." Again, "I wish they had all been asleep when they began this business of *ordination*." Here are the opinions of two nameless preachers, neither of them saying any thing about the ordination of Dr. Coke; but who speak about the *fact* of ordination taking place as a matter about which there could be no doubt. How much does such testimony make in favor of Mr. Bolles' position that Mr. Wesley never intended to *ordain*, but only to *bless* his preachers? Was this the cause of such offense to these two preachers that they wished they had all been asleep before they commenced this work of *blessing*? These two extracts are presented by Mr. B. as the opinion entertained by the English Methodists generally. According to the testimony of his witnesses, then, it was a fact at that time, about which there was *no doubt* in the English connexion, that the work of *ordination* among the Methodists *had commenced*!!!

Mr. B's third witness is Mr. Charles Wesley, the brother of John, with Dr. Whitehead's comments as advocate. The introduction of this witness is prefaced by a eulogy which is far from being a candid representation of his true character. I have no wish or desire to detract from his many virtues. He was a christian, a poet, and a sound divine, who had many seals to his ministry; but, when to serve a cause any one shall go so far from the facts of the case as to say that he was the equal in labor and success, and the superior in an unblemished character to John, he either betrays his ignorance or perverts what he knows to be truth. Mr. B., to sustain his high description of his witness, refers to a work entitled "The Life of Wesley, and the Rise and Progress of Methodism, by Robert Southey, Esq. Poet Laureate," a gentleman who held such high Church views as to consider it proper to make *Spiritual Christianity* the subject of ridicule, and who, in his work, did such injustice, in his animadversions upon the Theological and Disciplinary principles of Methodism and to the man whose life he attempted to delineate, that the Conference appointed Mr. Watson to review it, which Mr. W. did so effectually that, it is said, the Prince Regent, afterward George

the Fourth, upon reading it remarked, "Mr. Watson has the advantage over my Poet Laureate." This Review is called "Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley: being a Defense of the Character, Labors, and Opinions of the Founder of Methodism against the misrepresentations of that Publication," which the reader should consult before giving any credit to the statements found in the work of Mr. Southey. And yet Mr. B. refers to this production as though its authority was indisputable. For Dr. Bangs to refer to authorities which Churchmen have called in question is a very dishonest, high handed business in the estimation of Mr. Bolles; but for the Rector himself to quote as authority the refuted opinions of known and avowed enemies of Methodism, is a very different affair.

Mr. Charles Wesley was a high Churchman in theory, and, of course, opposed to ordination by Presbyters; and the correspondence between the brothers show how deeply he was afflicted with the conduct of John in his ordinations. He imagined and predicted, the most disastrous consequences. He supposed that Dr. Coke, having organized a Methodist Episcopal Church here, would return to England and advocate a similar organization there. It was with these excited feelings he wrote the letter to Dr. Chandler in which he says, "what will become of those poor sheep in the wilderness, the American Methodists? What are your poor Methodists now? Only a new sect of Presbyterians. And after my brother's death, which is now so near, what will be their end? They will lose all their influence and importance; they will turn aside to vain janglings; they will settle again upon their lees; and, like other sects of Dissenters, come to nothing;" "Such were the distressing feelings of Mr. Charles Wesley" says his biographer "in reference to his brother's ordinations for America. Of his perfect sincerity no doubt can be entertained. As a poet he was a prophet by general consent; but never were unfortunate vaticinations more completely disproved by time, than those which he uttered on this occasion. Nearly sixty years have now elapsed since those ordinations were performed, and the name of John Wesley, so far from being dishonored by an indelible blot, is still as ointment poured forth, and was never more respected. The American Methodists, so far from losing their influence and importance, from 'turning aside to vain janglings,' from 'settling upon their lees,' and from 'coming to nothing,' in consequence of the ordinations which were given to them, have from that time gone on to prosper beyond all former example; so that at this day they are the most numerous body in the Union. Their Church has indeed violated the theory of a succession of Bishops as a distinct order from the Apostles. It has an Episcopacy which was originated by a Presbyter; but it has not been a whit the less salutary on this account.

As an instrument of extensive spiritual good to the souls of men, it appears to immense advantage when compared with the American Episcopacy with which Bishop Seabury stood connected. In the Methodist Church the great design of the sacraments, of preaching, and of ecclesiastical discipline, has been answered. The members are undeniably justified through faith in the blood of Jesus, and are sanctified by the power of the Holy Ghost. Husbands and wives, parents and children, the aged and the young, the rich and the poor, the master and the servant, have exhibited, and still exhibit, both in life and death, the piety, the zeal, the charity, the justice, the holiness, peace, and joy of Apostolical Christianity, which Mr. Charles Wesley has described in his incomparable hymns. Could he have witnessed the triumphant extension of the work of God in connection with the ordinations, which at the time almost broke his heart, he would have smiled at his honest mistake, and have wiped away his needless tears."—(Jackson.)

Equally groundless were Mr. C. Wesley's fears of the effect these American ordinations would produce upon the English Methodists; for Dr. Coke, on his return to England, advocated no such measures—pursued no such course as he had predicted. Hence, while we love his memory, we can but smile at his gloomy forebodings which "time has demonstrated had no just foundation." The correspondence between the two brothers, only a part of which Mr. B. has seen fit to publish shows, first, that good men may be mistaken, and that Charles Wesley, however pious, was no prophet (except in poetry.) Second, that the strong and tender love which existed between these two brothers, would have prevented John from acts of ordination but for the firm convictions of duty—he would rather grieve his best friend than not thus provide for his spiritual children. Third, that Charles Wesley's opposition to his brother's ordinations was rather "a matter of feeling, than of reason and argument. He proposed nothing feasible for meeting the wants of American and Scottish Methodists." He was as great a *practical* separatist as there was in the connexion. John seldom preached in Church hours; but Charles acting under no Episcopal control, preached twice every Sabbath in chapels licensed by no Bishop, and that too in church hours, and administered to his people a weekly sacrament. He preached abroad; formed societies, and prayed extempore. He spurned canonical regularity when it was in the way of doing good, and spoke of the impiety of the Clergy and Bishops of the Establishment, in more severe terms than his brother ever used. It is also evident, that towards the close of his life he became less hostile to his brothers ordinations. Within a year of his death he wrote to him saying, "stand to your own proposals. Let us agree to differ. I leave America and

Scotland to your latest thoughts and recognitions." "Keep your authority while you live; and after your death *de tur dignioribus*. You cannot settle the succession." Fourth, this correspondence proves, that in the opinion of Charles Wesley, his brother John had *ordained* Dr. Coke. In his letter to Dr. Chandler, as published by Mr. Bolles, he says, that John "*ordained elders, consecrated a BISHOP*, and sent him to *ordain* the lay preachers in America." In his letter to his brother, he says, "when once you began *ordaining* for America, I knew, and you knew that your preachers here would never rest till you *ordained* them." Mr. C. Wesley admits that the cause of this, his sore grief, was the acts of his brother, which acts Mr. B. has attempted to show he never performed. Should we not suppose that his brother would have removed his grief by denying the allegation; by saying, that *he had not* ordained Dr. Coke—that he only designed to *bless* him? no such consolation, however, is found in his reply; for an acknowledgement of the act is inferred by the justification of it. Yet, on Mr. Bolles' position, Mr. C. Wesley, had no real cause for this grief, for Mr. B. would have us believe, and introduced this witness to prove, that his brother John never had attempted to ordain his preachers—he only put his hands upon them as a token of his *blessing*! How great the darkness which should conceal this fact from the poets mind? How much to be deplored that this wiseacre of Batavia had not lived in England about 1784 instead of living in America in 1843? There is no telling what a deal of grief and trouble the communication of his knowledge might have saved his witness from enduring. The testimony of this witness is against Mr. B. and directly and fully in favor of the affirmative of the question.

Mr. Bolles' fourth branch of testimony, is taken from the credentials of Dr. Coke, and the Circular brought by him from Mr. Wesley to Mr. Asbury and the American brethren—Dr. Whitehead still acting as advocate. To the Doctor's comments on the testimony I make no reply. A man who can write as he does is not worthy of a reply; and the spirit that can introduce such matter is not to be envied. Mr. B. admits that Dr. Coke, claimed to have been consecrated a Superintendent or Bishop over the American Methodists—that at the first General Conference after his arrival here, he produced his credentials which satisfying the body over whom he is to preside, he was elected and received by the conference as their Superintendent—that Mr. Asbury, at this Conference was elected first a Deacon, then an Elder, and lastly a Superintendent, and by Dr. Coke and three presbyters, he was ordained by three successive consecrations to these offices. This Mr. B. thinks is sufficient evidence that Dr. Coke *claimed* to have been ordained by Mr. Wesley. The testimony

of the Doctor must, be invalidated. Here is a task of no ordinary magnitude. He is to prove the existence of iniquity, and, iniquity too of no ordinary character; if he has succeeded, he has done a service to the church and to the world for which he should receive their thanks; for, surely, if Dr. Coke and Mr. Wesley were what he represents them to be, it is time that the Church and the world knew it. If these men, who have been regarded by those who were the most intimate with them as examples of devotion to the cause of Christ, scarcely paralleled in zeal, sacrifice, and usefulness since the days of St. Paul, were as base as the Rector would have us think they were, it is time the world had the facts, and to furnish them would be the duty of him who had them in possession. It is marvelous, that Mr. B. holding this deposit has delayed the work so long; for how must his heart been pained in reading the glowing sketches of these men, in which they were described as such eminent servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is strange, indeed, that however cool and self-possessed he may be, however unwilling to afflict his Methodist brethren, he had not, either from his great love of truth, or from the excitement which such descriptions are calculated to produce upon a pious heart, long, ere this, performed a work, which, if founded in fact, would be justice both to the dead and to the living. But, if in the sequel it shall be found that his constructions are unwarranted—that he has “no good and sufficient reason” for this attack upon the integrity of these men, then must he expect that this attempt to asperse the characters of Messrs. Wesley and Coke will bring upon him the scorn and contempt of all reflecting minds.

To show that Mr. Wesley never designed to ordain Dr. Coke, Mr. B. examines the credentials which he gave him—the first of which is the certificate of his ordination. On the certificate signed by Mr. Wesley, and in which he declares that he had “set apart as a Superintendent, by the imposition of my hands, and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) Thomas Coke, doctor of civil law, a Presbyter of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work. And I do hereby recommend him to all whom it may concern, as a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ”—on this certificate he draws the following conclusions, which I am sure will create a smile on the face of all familiar with the history of Methodism. “First, that when this document was written, Mr. Wesley did not intend that the Methodists in this country should separate from the Church of England.” True, for the Methodists in this country were not at that time connected with the Church of England, and it would have been folly for him to have intended us to separate from that with which we had no connection; and Mr. Wesley acknowledges in another document brought by Dr. Coke

that God had strangely made us free, and he did not wish us again to be entangled with the Church of England. Of the fact of our prior separation, admitting that there had been a connection, there can be no doubt, for to use the argumentum ad hominem, I find in the Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church the following declaration, "but when in the course of Divine Providence, these American States became independent, with respect of Civil Government, their Ecclesiastical Independence was necessarily included, and the different religious denominations of christians in these States were left at *full* and *equal* liberty to model and organize their respective Churches and forms of worship and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistent with the Constitution and Laws of their Country." Unless the Rector calls in question the truth of his Prayer Book he must admit, that for eleven years prior to the signing of Dr. Coke's credentials we were free and independent of the English hierarchy, and left at full and equal liberty with his own communion, to model and organize our Church, our form of worship, and discipline, in such manner as we might judge most convenient for our future prosperity, provided we did not violate the laws of our country; and no greater liberty than this have we claimed or exercised. After such a declaration made by the Protestant E. Church, with what consistency can she talk about our separating from the Church of England? And how ridiculous for a minister of the Church which was organized under such a declaration to put forth as a grave conclusion drawn from a document issued some eleven years subsequent to this acknowledged independence of all religious denominations in the United States, that at the time of signing this document, "Mr. Wesley did not intend that the Methodists in this country should separate from the Church of England!" If such a conclusion does not create a smile, it must be because the reader is greatly deficient in the organ of mirthfulness.

"Secondly that when this document was written, Mr. Wesley had no design of establishing a new Methodist Episcopal Church, in America." True, Mr. Wesley had no design of doing this himself, nor did he claim the right of doing it, or of dictating our form of Church Government, or of imposing upon us a General Superintendent. His authority over the Methodists, according to Mr. Bolles' Prayer Book ceased with the Declaration of our National Independence. The Methodists in America had not asked Mr. Wesley to establish a Church here, but having great respect for his opinions they did, as he says, ask his *advice*, which he gave and drew up a "little sketch" for our consideration. He also ordained a Superintendent and two Elders, subject, of course, to reception or rejection by the American Preachers: who receiv-

ed them as also his advice. If Mr. B. means to be understood as saying, that Mr. Wesley did not expect the American Methodists would organize themselves into a Church, with a General Superintendent or Scriptural Episcopacy, we join issue with him and are prepared to prove that Mr. Wesley did expect the American Methodists would form such a Church. If Mr. Wesley had not such expectations, why did he provide us with a Superintendent, with a Book of Discipline, containing not only services for the administration of the sacraments, but also for ordaining to the office of Deacon, Elder, and Superintendent? Why did he say, that we were at full liberty simply to follow, not the Church of England, but "the Scriptures and the primitive Church?" And why did he advise that we "should stand fast in that liberty"? This design of organizing was opened by Dr. Coke to the American preachers. Richard Whatcoat, who must have had a correct acquaintance with the intentions of Mr. Wesley, was present, and when Dr. Coke stated the design of organizing the Methodists into an "Episcopal Church," if Mr. Whatcoat knew that this was contrary to Mr. Wesley's intentions, it was his duty to have so stated. Mr. Whatcoat's universally admitted character as a man of unimpeachable guilelessness, and honesty, is a sufficient guarantee that he would have done so, if he knew it was contrary to Mr. Wesley's views. Mr. Bolles must, therefore, involve Mr. Whatcoat also in the guilt of this knavish conspiracy, or else set him down as an ignorant tool. Yet Mr. Wesley, who knew him well, thought him not unworthy, two years after, to be recommended for the office of General Superintendent. Such are the consequences continually involved in Mr. Bolles' hypothesis.—(*Vide Defense of our Fathers*, p. 124.)

"Third, that Mr. Wesley did not then intend to ordain or consecrate Dr. Coke to any office whatever in the Christian ministry, but only to 'set him apart as a Superintendent.'" And why did he not intend "to ordain or consecrate" him? Because the certificate says "set apart"? This is the logic of Alexander McCaine, to which the Rector was probably directed by his "intelligent" associate, the "*Protestant Farmer*." Pray what more is ordination to "set apart by the imposition of hands and prayer with the assistance of other ordained ministers"? If this was not designed to be an ordination, then it was most awful trifling with sacred things. Will Mr. Bolles charge Mr. Wesley with such mockery and profanation? If it was not ordination, because the phrase "set apart" is used instead of the term "ordained," then are *none* of our ministers *designed* to be ordained; for this is the phrase used in all our certificates. Is Mr. B. prepared for the consequences of such logic and ready to assert that there is no *intended* ordinations in the Methodist E. Church—to load all our Bishops with such obloquy and our Church with sanctioning

such high handed iniquity? If this be our state then is it a fearful one? If this be our condition, why does Mr. B. charge us, as in tract No. 4, with departing from Mr. Wesley in presuming to ordain? For according to his argument (if such it may be termed) we have only a mock ceremony, which we never intended should be an ordination, and the certificates were not designed to be called ordination, but "set apart" certificates. The Rector should examine his own papers. Perhaps *he* may be in the same class; at least, the Church of Rome would place him there. Such are the consequences of his principles of "*verbality*." In our Book of Discipline, dated Sept. 9th, 1784, only seven days later than Dr. Coke's certificate, which constitutes the "little sketch" drawn up by Mr. Wesley in compliance with our request, is found forms for ordaining our ministers thus headed, "the form and manner of making and *ORDAINING* of *SUPERINTENDENTS, ELTERS, and DEACONS*—the *ordaining* of Deacons—the *ordaining* of Elders—the *ordaining* of Superintendents." This is most unequivocal evidence that Mr. Wesley used the terms "set apart," as synonymous with ordain, and that he designed we should *ordain* not only our Deacons, and Elders, but also our Superintendents. "Ordination" says the Westminster Assembly of Divines, "is the solemn 'SETTING APART' of a person to some public Church office." To what was Dr. Coke "set apart"? Not "to any office in the Christian ministry," says Mr. Bolles. What then? It set him apart, says his certificate, "to preside over the flock of Christ"; and, in another document, signed by Mr. Wesley, it says, "over our brethren in North America." How? Mr. Bolles says as a Superintendent. What is his work as such? To preside over the whole body of the Church, under certain restrictions and limitations—to ordain our ministers and exercise all the powers usually considered Episcopal, to do all of which duties Mr. Wesley invested him with full powers. Is not this an office in the "Christian ministry"? If not, then, indeed, has our high Church Rector retraced his steps to Presbyterial parity. So easy is it for one who reasons without settled principles to argue as a high Churchman on one page and as a Presbyterian on the next. The certificate then, according to Mr. B's conclusion, proves, that Mr. Wesley set apart Dr. Coke only as a Superintendent, with powers "to preside over the flock of Christ." Now this is all we claim Mr. Wesley did, and what Mr. B. undertook to prove he did not *intend* to do! And the doing of this we claim was intended to be, and in fact was, an *ordination*.

"Fourthly, That in virtue of the authority here conferred upon him, Dr. Coke could not, lawfully, exercise the office of Bishop in the Church of God." This is a mere begging of the question. The document says, that John Wesley "had set apart, by

the imposition of hands and prayer, being assisted by other ordained ministers, Thomas Coke, doctor of civil law, a presbyter of the Church of England, as a Superintendent over the flock of Christ." In that character he was received by the American Methodists. To say, that he had no right to exercise that office, is to assume as true what will not be granted, viz., that ordination by presbyters is not valid—"that *equals* cannot from among themselves constitute an officer, who, *as an officer*, shall be superior to any of those by whom he was constituted: that they can, is sustained by all experience and history, both civil and ecclesiastical: and equally so by common sense." As I said before, when Mr. B. shall make up an issue on the validity of presbyterial ordination, the ground will be examined and the question of *right* tested; but this is not the question now, and has nothing to do with the issue before us. Mr. Bolles has undertaken to prove from Dr. Coke's Certificate of Ordination, that Mr. Wesley never *intended* to ordain him—that his consecration was a solemn farce, being nothing more than a token of his blessing, and after examining it, he comes to the conclusion, that it *only* proves Mr. Wesley set him apart, by prayer and the imposition of hands, assisted by other ordained ministers, as a Superintendent over the flock of Christ! Pray, what more do we wish it to prove? If it proves this, it proves all that Methodists have ever claimed for it, and less than this cannot be denied, for these are the terms of the document. Now, Mr. B. having stated that Dr. Coke was a Superintendent over the flock of Christ, and having admitted, that every bishop in one sense is a Superintendent, I know not by what rule of correct reasoning he will avoid the conclusion that, in one sense, Dr. Coke was a bishop.

What force there is in what Mr. B. says about Bishop and Superintendent being convertible terms, I am not able to perceive. When have Methodists claimed that a Superintendent in the Church of God was, by virtue of that office, a Superintendent of Colleges, Common Schools, Canals, &c.? The common sense of most men would teach them, that the jurisdiction of a Superintendent would be defined by the commission he had received from the body that had placed him in that office. Is it absurd for a Superintendent to claim the jurisdiction thus granted him? Is it absurd for a Superintendent, duly ordained to that office in the "christian Church," to claim the powers of that office in that Church? Mr. Bolles' argument here is a mere sophism.

The remarks of Mr. B. upon the Circular Dr. Coke brought from Mr. Wesley to Mr. Asbury and the Methodists in North America, will require but a brief notice, as his conclusions are so wide from any thing which the document authorizes, that one is at a loss to account for the construction here given. Because Mr. Wesley says in one part of it, that, in accordance with the

desire of some thousands in this country, he had drawn up "a little sketch," and in another part, speaks of a "Liturgy" he had prepared, the Rector concludes that they are not one and the same, for the reason, that in the latter reference it reads—"and liturgy." If the two allusions were connected, as Mr. Bolles would insinuate, there would be some propriety in his conclusion. But it does not read "I have drawn up a little sketch and prepared a liturgy." The first allusion occurs where Mr. Wesley is speaking of the reasons which induced him to provide *ordained* ministers and a plan of government for his brethren in North America. The reasons for the first were, that he was convinced he had the right to ordain to the ministry, and that our independence had placed us on such ground that in doing it he invaded no man's right. The reasons for the last were, we had asked it of him and he saw no impropriety in acceding to the request. His second allusion occurs in another part of the document, in which he is stating what he had done. He had from the above reasons provided us with minutes, and gives their names; he had drawn up "a little sketch" which to save repetition, he here calls "liturgy." Now, that in this latter reference he refers to the ordination and little sketch, for the execution of which he had been assigning reasons, is evident from the manner in which it is introduced. "I have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke," &c. "and I have prepared a liturgy" &c. This is so plainly the true construction, that it is difficult to account for any individual's holding a different one. That this view is correct is further evident from the contents of the "liturgy." It was dated Sept. 9th, 1784, one day earlier than the document now reviewed—hence the remark in this "I have prepared," &c., and contained all that was necessary for the peculiar ecclesiastical condition of the Methodists in North America; for it embraced not only "Sunday services," but services for the "burial of the dead, matrimony, ordaining of Deacons, Elders, and Superintendents;" and, that he was authorized in using the term liturgy to include all these items, will appear from the language of the Convention of the Protestant E. Church, Oct. 16th 1789, by which its liturgy was ratified. "This Convention having in this present session set forth A BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS AND OTHER RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH, do hereby establish said book: and they declare it to be THE LITURGY of the Church; and require that it be received as such by all the members of the same." Bishop White says, "the principal act of this session, was the preparing of the *Book of Common Prayer*, as now the established *Liturgy* of the Church." Says Bishop Brownell, "at the Convention of 1808 thirty Hymns were added to the *Book of Psalms and Hymns*. Since which time no changes have been made in our *Liturgy*." Here the

term "liturgy" is used as embracing all the forms, rites, ceremonies, orders, offices, psalms and hymns, which their Prayer Book "set forth or recommended." Other reasons might be given, but these must be sufficient to satisfy the candid, and these are all I expect to satisfy, that the little sketch and liturgy are one and the same. Mr. B.'s assertion, that this sketch has never been given to the world, unaccompanied with proof (for he had none to give) is a *dark* insinuation of imposition and fraud, which exhibits a malevolent spirit that would seek occasion to asperse the names of those at whose feet it would have been an honor for the Rector to have sat. Such assertions, however much they may affect the ignorant and the bigoted, will only excite in the minds of all who know the facts, pity for his ignorance and temerity.

"The book of Lord King, and the freedom of these Provinces from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are here pleaded" by Mr. Wesley says Mr. Bolles, "in justification of his ordaining travelling preachers." When Mr. B. shall prove that Dr. Coke—who, as a preacher of righteousness crossed the Atlantic nineteen times, besides performing various other subordinate voyages, whose journeys while on shore were almost without a parallel, travelling, while in America, with the offers of salvation from "the Mississippi to the Bay of Penobscot, and from the Chesapeake to the waters of Ohio," and who died while on a voyage as a Missionary to India—was not a "TRAVELLING preacher," he may have some ground for asserting, that this plea of justification by Mr. Wesley was not designed to include the ordination of the Doctor. But until he does this, Methodists, who have ever considered their Bishops "*travelling* preachers," will be likely to smile at the Rector's conclusion.

This letter to the brethren in North America declares, that Mr. Wesley had appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury Superintendents, &c. It was not necessary that it should say any thing about the *ordination* of the Doctor, for he had, eight days previous executed a Certificate testifying to that fact. Hence, it says just what we should expect a document from Mr. Wesley would say—the truth without one redundant word. When Mr. Bolles says, "that whatsoever office or power Mr. Wesley had conferred upon Dr. Coke, he had also conferred upon Mr. Asbury, who was then more than 3000 miles from him, and could not, therefore, have been ordained by him," he betrays, by thus confounding different things, either a want of discrimination or a desire to make a false impression. This letter is not to be considered, was not designed to be understood, as a certificate of *any* ordination, but as a Circular to the brethren in North America informing them of the provision that had been made for their necessities, among which provisions, was the appointment of Messrs. Coke and Asbury as

their Superintendents: not that he had ordained either of them; and hence, notwithstanding Mr. Wesley had thus appointed Mr. Asbury he was not admitted to that office, until he had been ordained to it by three Presbyters and one Superintendent, or Bishop, according to the formularies Mr. Wesley had sent over by Dr. Coke. Why did they not ordain Dr. Coke before receiving him if Mr. B's inference be a *true* one? Their not doing it is most conclusive evidence that the General Conference believed, that Dr. Coke *had been* ordained. Nor can this conclusion be avoided without branding that body with conniving at *hypocrisy* and *imposition* of the darkest character. A man who thus confounds different things must be considered deficient in perception or honesty.

Mr. B's fifth conclusion rests upon the same premises as the one we have just noticed, and needs no other refutation. His assertion, however, that Mr. Wesley sent over Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey "to act *as* Elders" when he knew them not to be "*really* Elders," is so evil a thrust at this servant of God, without any proof, that no reply will be attempted. Such a charge against such a man, without any proof, will not secure much respect to the author. Whether he designed it or not, he charges Mr. Wesley with being so destitute of moral principle, that he sent over to his brethren in North America, persons to officiate as Elders, in administering the sacraments of the Church, whom he knew had no right to perform this holy work, and he must involve in this charge, as partners in this crime, the persons thus sent and the Methodist Preachers in this country, for they must have known whether these gentlemen were acting under their *real* or false character. He admits, that Mr. Vasey had a little more conscience about this business than his associates, and when like the prodigal he came to himself *fully*, he applied to Bishop White and by him was made a *real* Elder. This is urged as most conclusive evidence, that Mr. Vasey did not believe that he was an Elder before. This is a common construction with high Churchmen. The moment a Clergyman from another Church seeks admission into theirs, he is proclaimed by them as being dissatisfied with his former ordination, as though no other motive could influence a man to seek such a change. What evidence has Mr. Bolles that Mr. Vasey believed his former consecration was invalid? Has he any statement of this fact made by the Rev. Gentleman? Will he presume to urge, that his submitting to reordination by Bishop White is good and sufficient evidence of such doubts? This submission is all the evidence he has, and all that is generally possessed. Is it sufficient? To say nothing how common sense would decide, his own Bishop White declares, that a reordination might be received without acknowledging the nullity of the former ordination. To which may be added the

testimony of Bishop Hoadly, who says, “The acceptance of *re-ordination* by the dissenting ministers, *would not be a denial of that right, which* (as they conceived) *Presbyters had to ordain.* Until, therefore, Mr. Bolles presents other evidence of Mr. Vassy’s doubts of his being a *real* Elder than the simple fact of his reordination by Bishop White, I shall consider his declaration an unwarranted assertion and unworthy of confidence. Such reasoning and inferences from unsound premises a good cause does not need, and a bad cause cannot be benefitted by it, only where the night of ignorance holds uninterrupted dominion, or mental imbecility renders the mind incompetent to reason.

Mr. Bolles asserts, “that Mr. Wesley’s reasons for not applying to the English Bishops for the ordination of his preachers are not true, in fact, because they have never claimed the right to govern those whom they ordained for this country.” It is true, that “when some young gentleman went to England, after the Revolution, to obtain Episcopal ordination the Archbishop of Canterbury was of opinion, that no English Bishop could ordain them unless they took the oath of allegiance. Mr. Southey says, they then applied for advice and assistance to Dr. Franklin, who was then our Minister in France. He consulted a French Clergyman, and found that they could not be ordained in France, unless they vowed obedience to the Archbishop of Paris; and the Pope’s nuncio, whom he consulted also, informed him that the Romish Bishop in America could not lay hands on them unless they turned Catholics. Franklin, therefore, advised them, either that the Episcopal Clergy in America should become Presbyterians, or that they should *elect a Bishop for themselves.*”—(Bishop Emory.) Whatever developments may have been made since the ordination of Dr. Coke as to what the English Bishops would do, it is sufficient to know, that at the time these reasons were assigned by Mr. Wesley, it was the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury that they had no right to ordain any without their taking the oath of allegiance. And, I have yet to learn, that English Bishops would even now ordain a Bishop for the Methodist Episcopal Church without our giving up any of the peculiarities of Methodism. Would the Bishops of the Protestant E. Church do it? The reason of the English Bishops subsequently ordaining for the Protestant Episcopalians without the oath of allegiance, may perhaps, be gathered from the following extract from a letter written by Granville Sharpe, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the purpose of prevailing with him, immediately to ordain Bishops for America. “An *immediate* interference is become the more necessary, not only on account of the PRETENSIONS of Dr. Seabury and the *nonjuring Bishops of Scotland* (to which, however, I hope my letter will have given a timely check,) but also to guard against the presumption of Mr. Wesley and other

Methodists, who, it seems, have sent over some persons under the name of *Superintendents*, with an assumed authority to ordain *Priests*, as if they were really invested with *Episcopal authority*."—(*Bishop White's Memoirs*.) Verily, this looks like *haste* on the side of the Royal Priesthood, through *Kings*, and *Queens*, from *Henry VIII.*, to put down the *pretensions* of *Wesley*, and *Dr. Seabury*. And it seems in the eye of the true Royal Succession, *Mr. Seabury's Episcopate*, is no better than *Dr. Coke's*, for his, is, a mere pretension. O! Succession, thou art a *mystery*!

Finally, *Mr. Bolles* concludes, that "there is no such evidence of the intended ordination or consecration of *Dr. Coke* as ought to be afforded in a case of so much importance," and that to claim ordination for him, on existing evidence, is a serious injury "to the spiritual interests of men," and a reflection upon "the reputation and character of *Mr. Wesley*!" It has been shown, that *Mr. Wesley* after consulting with his brethren, appointed a meeting for *Dr. Coke's* ordination—invited other ordained ministers to assist him, and after thus consecrating him executed a Certificate certifying to the fact—that the most intimate friends and bitter enemies of both these gentlemen believed it to be an ordination. Yet says *Mr. B.* there is no *such* evidence as the case requires! What other evidence could be given? Can the Rector present even *such*, or as good, evidence of the consecration of all *his Prelates* from the present incumbent of his Diocese up to *St. Peter*? How many instances along that chain where there is no evidence, but the mere assertion of some historian who lived centuries after, and this assertion preserved by a Church that had the power of destroying any counter testimony that might exist in the records of that age. Is not *such* a want of evidence a serious injury "to the spiritual interests of men" and a reflection upon that corporation of Prelates to whom is claimed the power of preserving the Priesthood? *Mr. B's* great regard for the character and reputation of *Mr. Wesley*, after having on the same page charged him with the sin of *Korah*, and with all the crimes that infidels ever charged upon the *Apostles*, is truly amazing. Before leaving this document it may be proper to apply it to the object for which it was professedly introduced, viz. as evidence that *Mr. Wesley* never intended to ordain *Dr. Coke*, and that his laying his hands upon him was only in token of his *blessing*. According to this issue, *Mr. Wesley* wrote this Circular to his brethren in North America, for the purpose of informing them, that he had *blessed* and sent over to them *Dr. Coke* and two other preachers! Fearing, perhaps, that some might wish to know by what authority he had thus presumed to *bless* these men, he wrote this Circular, in which he gravely sets forth his reasons and declares, that "Lord King's account of the primitive

Church convinced me, many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain [BLESS.] For many years I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise this right, by ordaining [*blessing*] part of our travelling preachers. But I have refused not only for peace's sake, but because I was determined, as little as possible, to violate the established order of the National Church." He then proceeds to show, that in America the case was different, and, according to Mr. B., he concluded that he should invade no man's right and, hence, felt at full liberty to BLESS and send us preachers. Will any man with an ordinary share of intellect venture to assert that such a ludicrous construction of this document is the true one? And yet Mr. Bolles would have the world believe that this is its proper interpretation!

CHAP. XVII.

Mr. Bolles' attack upon Methodist Episcopacy, alias, Dr. Coke, concluded—the confessions of Dr. Coke—his letter to Bishop White—his letter to Mr. Wilberforce—the character of Doctor Coke—his inconsistencies—his dishonesty—his general reputation—his management with Mr. Wesley. Conclusion.

Another branch of testimony presented by Mr. Bolles is taken from the *confessions* of Dr. Coke. These confessions are said to be contained in two *private* letters written by the Doctor, one to bishop White and the other to Mr. Wilberforce. In examining this branch of the testimony it is important, that the reader should have definitely before his mind the *kind* of confession applicable to the case. Mr. Bolles has undertaken to prove, that Mr. Wesley never intended to ordain Dr. Coke. Now if the Doctor has *confessed* that Mr. Wesley never intended to do this, if he has confessed that in all this matter they were the veriest hypocrites in the world, and the whole ceremony and Certificate was designed to deceive the community, then I admit such a confession would be in point, and when adduced would have great weight in deciding the question before us. But Dr. Coke might make confessions of wrong on a thousand other questions, which would have no bearing upon the present issue. This I conceive to be one of the fallacies of Mr. B. on this branch of his testimony. The issue he has made is lost sight of and what he construes as confessions on another matter is presented as evidence that Mr. Wesley never intended to ordain Dr. Coke! I have read the two letters of the Doctor and I find but one allusion to his ordination by Mr. Wesley. This occurs in his letter to Bishop White, but this allusion so far from being a confession that Mr. Wesley never *intended* to ordain him is a direct affirmation that he *had* ordained him. He says, “he,” Mr. Wesley, “*did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal authority.*” It may be said that the phrase “as far as he had a right so to do” implies doubt of his having a right to ordain him? The question of right has nothing to do with the present issue. The simple question is, did Mr. Wesley *intend* to ordain him? This Dr. Coke in his confession affirms to be true, that Mr. Wesley did intend “most solemnly to invest him with Episcopal powers.” Now if it should be proved, that Mr. Wesley and Dr. Coke both became subsequently satisfied that

they had exceeded their right, and hence, that the Doctor did not validly hold Episcopal powers, and both should make confession of it, so far from such confessions making any thing in favor of Mr. Bolles' position they would be evidence against him, for why such confessions of having exceeded their right by ordination if no ordination had been performed? I deny however that the letters contain any *such* confessions; and, though this has nothing to do with the present issue, yet as high Churchmen have, again and again, presumed to draw such an inference it may be proper to notice it briefly: for a full refutation, however, I would refer the reader to Bishop Emory's Defense of our Fathers, Dr. Bangs' Original Church of Christ, and Mr. Jackson's Letter to Dr. Pusey. "The propensity of the human mind to conjecture what is most accordant to support its own views, is too well known to require discussion here." This propensity has been fully gratified in the construction which high Churchmen have given of these letters, for, without any expressed doubt of the validity of his prior consecration, his proposal of a union between the Methodist and Protestant Episcopalians, is, by the latter construed as *prima facie* evidence that he did not consider his ordination valid. Now I contend, in accordance with the testimony of Bishops White and Hoadly already adduced, that the simple fact of a reordination (had this been required in case of a union) would have, in itself, been no evidence of doubts with regard to the validity of former ordination; for, a man may submit to a reordination, not for his own satisfaction, but, for the satisfaction of others. In the case of Dr. Coke, there is not only the absence of any declaration of doubts in his mind, but the positive declaration that he entertained no doubts on that subject. In a letter to Mr. Wesley prior to his ordination as Superintendent over the American Methodists, while speaking of his belief that Mr. Wesley had the right of investing him with "Episcopal powers" over this people, he says, "I HAVE NOT THE SHADOW OF A DOUBT, but God hath invested you with, ['the power of ordaining others,'] for the good of our connection." In his letter to Bishop White, he says, Mr. Wesley "did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal authority." In the former declaration, he says, he had not the shadow of a doubt but that Mr. Wesley had a right to invest him with Episcopal authority over the Methodists in America, not with Episcopal authority in the English or Protestant E. Church; for there he had no such jurisdiction, but with Episcopal authority over the Methodists in this country. And in the latter declaration, he says, that Mr. Wesley did most solemnly invest him with Episcopal authority over this people. He further says, in this letter to Bishop White, "our ordained ministers *will* not, *ought* not give up their *right* of administering the sacraments." Here is a most unequivocal avowal of

his belief that the ordination of the Methodist ministers was valid, else what *right* would they have had to administer the sacraments? Dr. Coke, certainly, has a right to be heard in his own defense. In a letter to Bishop Asbury, dated "near Leeds, Feb. 2, 1808," he refers to the letter he wrote Bishop White in 1791, and declares, that at the time he wrote it, he believed that such a union "would very much enlarge our field of action, and that myriads would, in consequence of it, attend our ministry who were then much prejudiced against us." He says, he intended by that letter merely to ascertain the sense of the Protestant E. Church upon the subject of a union, which if favorable he should have submitted to the General Conference, subject to their action: but, he affirms "I never intended that either you or I should *give up* our Episcopal ordination. My proposals secured our *discipline in all points*, I now see that the *failure* of my plan which was laid, from the purest motives, was for the best." To the Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, upon this subject, he writes, "I never, since I could reason on those things, considered the doctrine of the *uninterrupted Apostolical succession of Bishops* as at all valid or true. I am of our late venerable father, Mr. Wesley's opinion, that the order of Bishops and Presbyters is one and the same. I believe that the Episcopal form of Church Government is the best in the world, when the Episcopal power is under due regulations and responsibility. I believe that it is well to follow the example of the primitive Church, as exemplified in the word of God, by setting apart persons for great ministerial purposes by the imposition of hands: but especially those who are appointed for offices of the first rank in the Church. From all that I have advanced, you may easily perceive, my dear brethren, that I do not consider the imposition of hands on the one hand, as essentially necessary for any office in the Church; nor do I, on the other hand, think that the repetition of the imposition of hands for the same office, when important circumstances require it, is at all improper. If it be granted that my plan of union with the old Episcopal Church was desirable (*which now I think was not so, though I most sincerely believed it to be so at that time,*) then, if the plan could not have been accomplished without a repetition of the imposition of hands for the same office, I did believe, and do now believe, and have no doubt, that the repetition of the imposition of hands would have been perfectly justifiable for the enlargement of the field of action, &c., and would not, by any means, have invalidated the former consecration or imposition of hands. Therefore, I have *no doubt* but my consecration of Bishop Asbury was perfectly valid, and would have been so even if he had been reconsecrated. I never did apply to the General Convention, or any other Convention, for reconsecration. I never intended that either Bishop Asbury or myself should give up our

Episcopal office, if the junction were to take place; but I should have had no scruple then, nor should I now, *if the junction were desirable*, to have submitted to, or to submit to, a reimposition of hands, in order to accomplish a great object: but I do say again, I do not *now* believe such a junction desirable." Well may we adopt the language of Bishop Emory, and say, "we hope, after this, to hear no more of Dr. Coke's '*doubt*' of the validity of his Episcopal ordination, or that of Bishop Asbury; unless our modern race of writers can persuade us that they are better acquainted with the mind of Dr. Coke than he was himself." "Such assertions only serve to show how superficially those who make them have examined the subject; or how servilely they copy others. We should regret that the repetition of them should oblige us to give back the modest imputation either of ignorance or want of candor."

The above remarks will, I think, be a sufficient refutation of the construction which high Churchmen have made to this letter, and will, also, convince the candid that the object of the Doctor was to do good. In haste he made the proposition, without consulting his friends; but he lived long enough to see and confess his error in judgment. The publication of this *private* letter by the Protestant E. Church, has cleared us before the world of all wrong in having a separate organization from them, and whether it is honest for them to charge us with schism, after having spurned the proposals made by Dr. Coke, the reader must judge. The letter to Mr. Wilberforce was also *private* and *confidential*. For more than thirty years, as the reader will learn by perusing his life, written by Mr. Drew, the Doctor had thought much upon the subject of a mission to India. From circumstances unnecessary here to name, he was convinced, that he would be more likely to succeed in a mission there under the sanction of the Church of England, than in the character of a Methodist clergyman, and from this conviction, the time having arrived when he considered it his duty to go to that distant field, he offered his services to the English Church as a Missionary to India. The step was taken without consulting his friends, which is another evidence that his zeal was more than equal to his judgment. "That it was indiscreet all admit, but more than this to his disadvantage no man can prove. It bears upon the very face of it the character of an *honest man*," and was written for the purpose of accomplishing an object worthy of an Apostle. "The object which he proposed in going to India was not to provide for his children or near relations, for he had none; but to accomplish that which is the one design of all Methodist instrumentality whatever—'raising up a spiritual Church—beginning or reviving a genuine work of religion.' There is absolutely nothing in the letter that implies any *just* reflection upon Dr. Coke's upright-

ness and integrity. The only circumstance connected with it that his warmest admirers can lament is, that he asked for an appointment which it was not probable that he would receive; and the request for which might be turned to his disadvantage by the jealousy or the petty malice of men who could not sympathize with him in his high missionary feelings and designs." The publication of such communications which the author requested should be *burned* or kept *confidentially*, and which he was *assured* should be so kept, (as may be seen in their answer which Mr. Bolles has very wisely for his cause withheld,) and making them the foundation of charges of the foulest kind, assailing his *moral* character, not one of which can be sustained, is such a violation of truth, charity and propriety, such injustice both to the living and the dead, that few can approve; and a cause that needs for its support a recourse to such weapons must be feeble indeed. This construction of Dr. Coke's letters which we have been considering, has been made again and again, by high Churchmen and as often been refuted. Was it candid, was it honest, for Mr. Bolles to present these letters "as rare and curious documents" and gravely draw conclusions from them, that have been exploded for the ninety-ninth time, without any hint to the reader of these facts? This to him may appear just and fair, but I must confess, I know not by what principle such a conclusion can be reached. These letters, it has been shown, contain, first, no reflection upon Dr. Coke's uprightness or integrity. Second, no confessions that Mr. Wesley did not solemnly invest him with "Episcopal authority." How much the testimony drawn from "the *confessions* of Dr. Coke" make in favor of Mr. B's position, the reader can now judge.

The last branch of testimony adduced by Mr. Bolles is drawn from the *character* of Dr. Coke. Upon this point he seeks to make out that the Doctor's word is not worthy of credit. First, from "his inconsistencies;" Second, from "his dishonesty;" Third, from "his general reputation;" and Fourth, from "his management with Mr. Wesley."

If, because a man exhibits *inconsistency* in some acts of his life his word is, therefore, not to be believed, I fear the Rector will be found in a most unpleasant situation; for putting aside some reputation he enjoys, I think it has been shown in the preceding pages, that in more than one instance he has been inconsistent, and that too, without any apprehension that I was thereby involving him in such serious difficulty. But he cannot complain if he is tried by the same ordeal which he has instituted as the *test* of the Doctor's integrity. I am quite sure that with no other evidence than that which his book furnishes, he would not come from such a trial without the smell of fire upon his garments. But, is Dr. Coke justly chargeable with the inconsistencies which Mr.

Bolles adduces? It is alledged by him that the Doctor censured the Church of England in his sermon at the ordination of Mr. Asbury, and yet, in a letter to Mr. Wesley said he would as soon commit one of the vilest crimes as preach against the Church. Before this is admitted as an inconsistency, the declarations should be examined in connection with the circumstances under which they were made; all of which the reader will find, together with a refutation of the charge, in Dr. Coke's Life written by Mr. Drew. Now, it is not true that Dr. Coke censured the Church of England as a Church. So far from this, he speaks in the highest terms of its "liturgy," but he censured the *doctrine* and *practices* of *some* of its clergy, and of a large portion of them in Virginia, not the whole body; for he says, "there are many of them whose character I greatly esteem, and at whose feet I should think it an honor to sit." He is now speaking of the clergy of the Church of England, but in his letter to Mr. Wesley, according to Mr. Bolles, he is speaking of "the Church," which Dr. Coke, in his sermon, defines to be "a body of professors who hold the *fundamentals* of the Christian religion in *doctrine* and *practice*." His two declarations amount to this,—in his sermon he censures the wicked clergy of the Church of England—in his letter to Mr. Wesley he says, he would as soon commit the vilest crime as speak against a people who hold the fundamentals of the christian religion in *doctrine* and *practice*. Is there any thing inconsistent here? So much for Dr. Coke's *inconsistency* and Mr. Bolles' *candor*.

The *dishonesty* of Dr. Coke, Mr. B. attempts to prove, from his claiming things that did not belong to him. He says, "from the introduction to Dr. Adam Clark[e]l's Commentary we learn, that he claimed to be the author of Dodd's Commentary, which he was not." Let me say to the Rev. Gentleman he never learned any such fact from the source he names; for no such fact is there stated, and he cannot learn it where it is not to be found. That he might have inferred it from what Dr. Clarke there says is probable enough, but the Rector has taught us that no man is responsible for the inferences which others draw, hence, Dr. Clarke is not to be held responsible for the inferences of Mr. Bolles. In the introduction referred to, Dr. Clarke says, "the late unfortunate DR. WILLIAM DODD published a Commentary on the Old and New Testament, in three vol. folio, Lond. 1770.—It is chiefly taken from the Comment of *Father Calmet*, already described; but he has enriched his work by many valuable notes, which he extracted from the inedited papers of Lord Clarendon, Dr. Waterland, and Mr. Locke. He has also borrowed many important notes from Father Houbigant." "The REV. THOMAS COKE, L. L. D. has lately published a Commentary on the Old and New Testament, in six vol. 4 to. This is in the *main*, a

reprint of the work of Dr. Dodd." This is very different from saying that Dr. Coke "*claimed* to be the author of Dodd's Commentary which he was not." In the *main* he says that it was a reprint, and in the *main* Dr. Dodd's work was a reprint from other authors, but not a word of Dr. Coke's *claim*! Is Mr. Bolles acquainted with these works? If he is, it is difficult to account for such loose expressions. If he is not, his mistakes should be "a lesson of caution." It is true, Dr. Coke's Commentary contains many valuable extracts from the work published by Dr. Dodd, which, as we have seen, was made up of extracts from the writings of other eminent divines; but for these extracts, in addition to the usual marks of credit, the margin abounds with references. His biographer says, "to perfect originality he makes but few pretensions in any of his publications. His Commentary on the Bible, is *confessedly* a compilation, and *as such* he sent it into the world, announcing on the wrapper of almost every number, that 'he had been only like the bee, culling honey from every flower.' Of its genuine excellence no doubt has hardly ever been expressed." "It contains a little library of divinity, worthy of being transmitted to posterity." "The esteem in which it was held by the Methodist Conference, may be gathered from the vote of thanks which Dr. Coke twice received from that body of divines." Let the reader determine whether an author who makes the following ingenuous avowal of his indebtedness to others would be likely to engage in a forgery. In Dr. Coke's preface to his Appendix he holds the following language, "In prosecuting this inquiry [fulfilment of prophecy &c.] the author has had recourse to the most modern publications on the prophecies, which the present period has afforded: in these he has found much to admire and much to disapprove. It is not his province either to adopt implicitly whatever may appear plausible, or to enter into an elaborate refutation of what he may deem erroneous; his object is to give the reader some idea of the opinions to which the extraordinary transactions of Europe have given rise at the present day. And therefore without attempting either to vindicate or condemn what others have advanced, he has only endeavored to select from the whole mass, an Epitome of that theory which in his judgment appears most probable. The modern publications to which he chiefly alludes are those written by Mr. Richeno, Dr. Mitchel, Mr. Whitaker, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Kett, and Mr. Faber. From their pages he has taken the liberty, occasionally, to select *in sentiment* and sometimes in language, particulars in which they seem rather to agree than differ, but which he is well aware nothing but the flight of time can determine to be right." From these statements there can be no doubt of the *injustice* and *untruthfulness* of Mr. Bolles' charge.

Mr. B. further says "from the Life of Mr. Samuel Drew, we

learn, that he employed Mr. Drew for a pecuniary compensation, to write for him," and that the other works "bearing the name of Thomas Coke, LL. D., Mr. Drew was virtually and principally the author." How correctly Mr. Bolles has presented the sentiments of Mr. Drew's biographer, I am not able to decide, as I have not the work to consult, but of one thing I am quite sure, either the one or the other has taken great liberty with their authority, for it is fairly presumable that Mr. Samuel Drew himself knew as much about the matter as either his biographer or the Rev. Mr. Bolles. The language of Mr. Drew is, "very early in the year 1805, the author of these pages became more particularly acquainted with Dr. Coke, than he had been before. At this time his Commentary on the Bible was verging towards a close, and his History of the West Indies had acquired an embodied form. Being constantly engaged in soliciting support for the Missions, and finding their claims upon his exertions to increase daily, he lodged some papers in the author's hands, requesting him to examine them with attention, to notice defects, to expunge redundancies, and to give on some occasions a new feature to expressions. All this was accordingly done; and in many instances his recommendations were fully adopted. This intercourse subsisted for several years, and he received from Dr. Coke a pecuniary remuneration, in proportion to the time that was expended in his service." Still further Mr. Drew says, that Dr. Coke proposed to incorporate his name with the Doctor's on the title page, but for various reasons, unnecessary to notice, he declined the proposal.—(*Drew's Life of Dr. Coke*, p. 370.) In all this where is there the least semblance of dishonesty? What opinion must we form of a man who on *such* grounds will urge the charge of *dishonesty* against the *dead*? The most charitable is that his zeal to sustain his cause has overbalanced justice, judgment, and truth.

For Dr. Coke's *general reputation* and *management* with Mr. Wesley, Mr. Bolles presents no testimony but that of Dr. Whitehead—testimony that will have but little weight with those who are acquainted with the character of the witness. In regard to the management with Mr. Wesley, the statement carries falsehood upon its very face. Will any man acquainted with the facts believe, that Mr. Wesley *five months* prior to his death, was so broken down by the infirmities of age that he could not sit five minutes to hear any thing read without falling into a doze? So far from this being true, he performed at that period a greater amount of labor than most men at the meridian of life. His faculties were so *unimpaired* that he preached only the Thursday before his death—so true it was, that "he ceased at once to work and live." His death occurred while Dr. Coke was in America more than three thousand miles from him. As to the "Deed,"

if we admit the statements of Dr. Whitehead to be true, which we do not, there was nothing dishonorable in having it executed: for it contemplated simply, and was designed only to secure the execution of Mr. Wesley's Will, which, in the opinion of some, could not be done without such an instrument. The Will devoted the profits of Mr. Wesley's books and stock in trade, &c. to carrying on the great work of God by Itinerant Preachers. The *intent* of the Deed was to *secure* the application of those profits, as expressed in the Will.—(*Vide Myles' Hist. of the Meth.* p. 195.) Was there any thing dishonorable in suggesting to Mr. Wesley the propriety and importance of executing such an instrument? Is it improper to advise our friends or even assist them, if necessary, to make suitable provision for, not the *forming*, but simply the *EXECUTION* of their *will* and *desire* after their decease? “So much for the Doctors management with Mr. Wesley.”

As to the *general reputation* of Dr. Coke, Mr. Bolles has seemed to think that the testimony of Dr. Whitehead was all sufficient. This, perhaps, may be sufficient to satisfy his mind, but it will not be sufficient to satisfy all his readers. How would he like to have the same rule applied to him? Would he wish to have his general reputation decided by the testimony of his most bitter enemy? Is he willing to be weighed in such a balance? Nay, what would he think of a minister who should put forth the testimony of such an enemy and pronounce it as *good* and *sufficient* evidence for believing and publishing to the world that Mr. Bolles was a dishonorable, dishonest man, whose word was not to be believed, and that this was his general reputation? This would be but a parallel case to the one before us. Mr. B. must not think it strange, then, if the testimony of his witness is not satisfactory. With all *candid* minds the testimony of the associated bodies whom Dr. Coke so long served, would be more convincing than the opinions of individuals, whether friends or enemies. The General Conference of the Methodist E. Church held at Baltimore, May 1808, dictated a letter to the Doctor, then in England, and another to the British Conference, in which is found, among other resolutions, the following: “Resolved, That we do retain a grateful remembrance of the services and labors of Dr. Coke among us; and that the thanks of this Conference are hereby acknowledged to him, and to God, for all his labors of love towards us, from the time he first left his native country to serve us.” To this resolution the British Conference thus responded: “What you have said concerning our present worthy Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Coke, is no matter of wonder to us, who have long known his value, the honor which our Lord has put upon him, and have enjoyed the fruit of his labor. By a vote of our Conference this day he was requested to continue, in case his engagements with you, should admit of it.” To this part of

the Address our General Conference replied: "Your request for the continuance of our beloved brother Dr. Coke among you, has been taken into the most serious and solemn deliberation in our Conference; and in compliance with your request, a vote has passed that he may continue with you until he may be called to us by all the Annual Conferences respectively, or the General Conference. We are, however, not insensible of his value, or ungrateful for his past labors of love. And we do sincerely pray that the everlasting God may still be with him, and make him a blessing to hundreds and thousands of immortal souls." The British Conference in their Minutes for the year 1815 say, "from 1786, Dr. Coke had the principal direction of our Missions, and to this glorious cause he entirely yielded up all his time, strength, and talents. It has been truly stated that for many years he stooped to the very drudgery of Charity, and gratuitously pleaded the cause of a perishing world from door to door. Under his influence, Missions were established in almost every English Island and in the West Indies. The flame of his Missionary zeal burst forth on British America. Methodist Societies were also formed by him, or under his superintendence in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Islands on the eastern coast of the American Continent, and subsequently in the Bahamas, and Bermuda; and to the coast of Africa he also directed his zealous efforts." In the year 1807 the Irish Conference, to the British Conference thus speak of him, "from the fulness of our hearts, dear Fathers and Brethren, we again repeat our request for the return of our greatly beloved and esteemed friend DR. COKE, to be President for the ensuing year. We are deeply conscious what a blessing he is to us, though we cannot fully tell how much we are indebted to him." In 1809, they again say, "we thank you for sending, with such readiness, our old, much beloved friend, the REV. DR. COKE, as our President year after year." In 1813, just before he left Europe for India and found a grave in the Ocean, they again say, "we need hardly assure you, that we received the appointment of our dearly beloved brother and President, DR. COKE, with the best affections of our hearts; and that his visit has been profitable and comfortable to our souls." To this the English Conference replied, "we have a prospect of sending the Word of Life to the East. Our beloved brother Dr. Coke, burning with zeal to God, is about to visit that country, accompanied by seven Missionaries, so that we hope pure Christianity, as taught by us from the beginning, will soon extend its influence through those populous and extensive regions." Such is the testimony concerning this servant of Christ of the three great bodies the American, the Irish, and the British Conferences, whom he so long and profitably served.

To the above we may add the opinions of persons who knew

him well. **BISHOP ASBURY**, who certainly had sufficient opportunities to know him says, "he was of the third branch of the Oxonian Methodists—of blessed mind and soul—a gentleman, a scholar, and a Bishop to us—as a minister of Christ, in zeal, in labors, and in services, the greatest man of the last century." **MR. DREW**, his biographer says, "of his genuine piety and devotedness to God, he furnished all the evidence which either reason or revelation has taught us to expect in this region of mortality. This was not an evidence arising from a momentary gush of rapture, or from the imposing glare of voluntary humility. It is to be found in all his writings—it is to be discovered in all his letters—it was to be gathered from the spirit which enlivened all his public discourses—and it is recorded in various parts of his journals, in those incidental expressions which register his deep and uninterrupted communion with God." "In his outward conduct he manifested the fruits of that internal principle which influenced his heart. Through a long, a laborious, and a diversified life, it will be difficult for even malice itself to fix upon him a charge of moral turpitude, that shall at once involve the action and the motive. In tracing Dr. Coke to his grave, we see the Church deprived of a burning and a shining light." **DR. CLARKE** speaking of him says, "many thousands of souls have been [by his instrumentality] brought to the knowledge of God. He gave his life to this work—it was his meat and his drink—and the convulsive effort that terminated his days, was a Missionary exertion to take the Gospel to the heathens of Serendib." **MR. JACKSON**, after describing his death at sea, and his burial in the great deep, which few can read without melting into tears, says, "such was the end of Dr. Coke, one of the most disinterested, laborious, and useful men of modern times." From many allusions to this man of God, made by the eloquent **SUMMERFIELD**, I extract the following: "God has ever raised up men willing to die in the harness while drawing along the Ark of our God, and among the distinguished the name of *Coke* will stand high enrolled! Possessed of a body naturally weak—for it was born to ease, yet trained to hardship in the school of Christ—nineteen times he crossed the great Atlantic; as no dangers could intimidate him, so no obstacles could damp the ardor of his soul; he was the slave of Jesus! But alas! he is not; for God took him. He fell a victim to his zeal, and sunk into the ocean's bed. The body of this Moses has indeed been hidden from us; but we sorrow not as those without hope; 'his frame unwasted by disease, his features not distorted by pain,' show the hand of mercy in the dispensation; the silver cord was gently untied, and the spirit dismissed, while the body was committed to the watery grave in its accustomed bloom—fair presage of its beauteous resurrection! He shall not be forgotten; for on that day when God shall

count his jewels, Coke shall be gathered from the ocean's bed, a diamond of the purest water." Pages of such testimony might be presented, but this must suffice.

Such is the man who had spent his life in propagating Christianity—in directing sinners to the Saviour of the world—in carrying the light of the Gospel among heathen nations—against whom invidious and slanderous tongues have poured forth their base insinuations, and unmerited censure, so true it is that "censure is a tax which every man must pay the public for being eminent." Such is the man that Mr. Bolles has attempted to vilify, and would have the world believe on the word of an enemy, that he was a base impostor, without truth or shame; whose word was not to be believed. Is it possible, that he knew the character of the man he was attempting to blacken? If not, what right had he thus to assail him, and if he did how can charity shield Mr. B. from censure for having thus unjustly sought to asperse the character of one who had expended a large fortune in doing good to the souls and bodies of men? Who had crossed the ocean nineteen times upon the errand of salvation, and finally died while taking *seven* missionaries with himself *at his own expense* to the far distant, dark, and benighted India? By what principle of morality Mr. Bolles can be justified in heaping his contumelies upon the memory of such a devoted servant of Christ, it is not for me to say. For a man to torture a fertile ingenuity to fasten upon such a person the basest motives and the vilest crimes, and that without the least shadow of evidence, is a course of proceeding which, to my mind, seems most uncharitable and cruel; and the more so, as death has made it impossible for the hand or the tongue thus calumniated to be used in self-defense. To despoil him now when he is dead and in his grave, of a reputation earned by a devotedness little less than that of the martyrs, is a work that ill accords with the professions of a minister, or with the spirit and principles of the Christian religion—a work which betrays a hyenial spirit, that delights to feast itself upon the relics of the charnal house. "The writer who attempts to filch from the illustrious dead a single wreath of virtue or of glory, is little entitled to our approbation or gratitude. His appropriate task is to vindicate, not to impeach that reputation which has been consecrated by death and time. He who employs himself in reviving exploded calumnies against the wise and good, or 'raking from the rubbish of oblivion every thing that is not worth remembering, or which ought to have been forgotten,' or who is keen sighted

'Quam aut aquila, aut serpens Epidaurius'

in discovering new foibles, though, as the world is, he may have readers and admirers, and even find panders and retainers who

will aid and abet in preparing and circulating his works, yet neither can the one or the other be an object of our envy, or of our imitation. Personages of this description, to use the language of De Foe, seldom indeed are deficient in their 'own good word' for themselves—yet,

‘The better to establish their good name,
—Never fail their neighbor to defame.’”

Bishop Emory has well said “an over loaded piece is sure to recoil, and often does more damage to him that uses it, than to those against whom it is directed. To us, indeed, it seems a poor compliment even to partisans, to treat them as if they possessed a cannibal appetite, which nothing can satiate short of the scandalizing both the living and the dead; and such a spectacle among professing Christians, and much more among professing Christian Ministers, cannot but be loathingly revolting to any enlightened and virtuous community, before whose face the repast may be spread. There are, on the contrary, persons, doubtless, whom such feasts not only gratify, but delight: and they will find purveyors. But for our own part, and on that of our friends, it is to us a most desirable triumph to be enabled to pursue a course which, like the path of the just, shall shine ‘more and more’; and only the brighter if set off by a contrast. In this path we shall secure the approbation of all whose approval should be wished. And, what is best of all, and in any event, we shall be sure of the approbation of our own consciences, and of our ‘God.’” These remarks, which might be easily extended, will, I conceive, be sufficient to illustrate the *candor* of Mr. Bolles, and the confidence that should be placed upon his representation of *character*. In thus repelling the unjust and cruel censures which Mr. B. has uttered against the name of Coke, I have only performed an act of justice both to the living and to the dead. I have sought to strip off chicanery and misrepresentation—to wipe the foul breath of calumny from the tomb of the illustrious dead, that truth, and truth only, might stand forth in its strong and convincing light. And I trust it has been made to appear that the name of Coke, the Missionary and Martyr, may still be respected, and his word believed, notwithstanding the anathemas that have thundered forth from the Rector of St. James.

I have now passed through Mr. Bolles’ examination of Methodist Episcopacy. I have endeavored to meet, candidly, every position he has taken, and all the testimony he has adduced, and though I might have said much more and have extended my list of authorities to far greater length, yet, I think, sufficient has been presented to overthrow each and every position, and to show that he has not one *particle* of evidence to sustain his issue. His mountain of *difficulties*, that he reared at the threshhold of the investigation, with so much *tact*, has been shown to be the

creature of his imagination—an ideal elevation without any real existence—which vanished as it was approached, without leaving a wreck behind. His *witnesses* have been shown to be not of that class to have weight in this issue and *their testimony* is of no avail. It has been seen that all the *documentary* evidence that he has presented, contains not a word in his favor, and as explained by the common rules of interpretation, and as understood by friends and enemies at the time of their execution are all against him. The *confessions* of Dr. Coke, upon examination, have been found to be, not that Mr. Wesley never intended to ordain him, but an acknowledgement that he *did* most solemnly invest him with Episcopal authority. His *general reputation* has been shown to be not that of a *knave* and liar, but a man of *unimpeachable honesty* and *truth*. Such is the result of the case merely from examining the testimony and argument presented by Mr. Bolles. Before dismissing it, I ask the reader to weigh a few considerations which, had not this review lengthened on my hands far beyond my expectations, I should dwell upon more fully.

Some years before the consecration of Dr. Coke, Mr. Wesley had renounced his belief in the *divine right* of Diocesan Episcopacy, for he says, “that it is prescribed in Scripture, I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of, ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet’s *Irenicum*. I think he has unanswerably proved, that neither Christ nor his Apostles *prescribed* any form of Church government; and that the plea of *divine right* for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church.”

In this view he was sustained by a large portion of the most pious and learned of the English clergy. One of the ablest theologians in the reign of Charles II, says, “though both the definition and institution of a bishop be uncertain, and there is no universal consent with respect of either, yet I think a constant *Superintendent*, not only over the people, but the presbyters, within reasonable precinct, if he be duly qualified and rightly chosen, may be lawful, and the place agreeable to Scripture: yet I do not conceive that this kind of Episcopacy is founded on any *divine* special precept of universal obligation, making it necessary for the being of a Church, or essential constitution of presbyters. Neither is there any Scripture which determines the form, how such a Bishop, or any other, may be made.” This is as Mr. Wesley believed—this is Methodism—Methodist Episcopacy.

Mr. Wesley also believed, that an Episcopal form of Church government well agreed with the practice and writings of the Apostles, for he says, “as to my own judgment, I still believe the Episcopal form of Church government to be Scriptural and Apostolical: I mean, well agreeing with the practice and wri-

tings of the Apostles." Hence with such a belief, in the establishment of a form of Church government we might expect, he would carry out the principles of his faith. Mr. Wesley was also satisfied, that, as a presbyter he had a right to constitute such a superintendency; or in other words, to ordain; for his language is, "Lord King's account of the primitive Church convinced me, many years ago, that bishops and presbyters have the same right to ordain." He says he believed himself to be "a Scriptural Episcopos, as much as any man in England or in Europe." And this he said not as meaning that he was a bishop over a single congregation merely, for such he was not, but "a bishop in fact," invested with the right of exercising Episcopal authority, in ordaining preachers to administer the ordinances of Christ's positive institution to his numerous Societies, or else it did not meet his brother's objection. And though for peace sake he refrained from using that power for a time, yet in "the exigence of necessity" he considered it his duty to declare himself not only a bishop in *fact* but a bishop in *action*. In accordance with these views Mr. Wesley did ordain preachers for Scotland and for his societies in England, as the reader will find fully sustained on pages 33 and 40 of this work.

At the time it is claimed Mr. Wesley consecrated Dr. Coke, he made all the preliminary arrangements necessary for a regular ordination. He consulted with his preachers at Leeds, as to the necessity and propriety (not the *right*) of doing it—appointed the place and time of meeting, and invited other ordained ministers to assist him in the consecration. At the meeting, the services were conducted as is usual on such occasions of ordination. Dr. Coke was set apart by prayer and the imposition of hands—what more is an ordination than a setting apart of the candidate by prayer and the imposition of hands? The services being ended, Mr. Wesley executed for Dr. Coke, a certificate of ordination—I say ordination for the phrase "set apart," I have shown is not only the meaning of the word, but the usual form of expression in making out such certificates. Accompanying this certificate, was a circular, written by Mr. Wesley to his brethren in North America, containing a justification of his exercise of Episcopal prerogatives in ordaining and sending them a Superintendent, and two Elders. With these documents Mr. Wesley sent over for his American brethren, by the hand of Dr. Coke, forms of ordination, among which, is found one for the *ordination* of Superintendents. The title of which, as affixed by Mr. Wesley, is "the form of *ordaining* of a SUPERINTENDENT;" thereby making provision for perpetuating a moderate episcopacy, which in the consecration of Dr. Coke, he claimed to have established. At the time this ordination took place both friends and enemies believed, that Mr. Wesley had thus consecrated Dr. Coke; their

friends, or the Doctor would have been rejected and tried for falsehood; their enemies, or they would not have so bitterly persecuted him for having exercised episcopal powers. Mr. Wesley never censured Dr. Coke for claiming to have been thus consecrated, nor the Methodists here for receiving him in his Episcopal character and organizing under the title of "the Methodist *Episcopal Church*." The minutes of our organization were reprinted in London the next year after Dr. Coke's return to England, under the eye of Mr. Wesley, in which our title is retained. Now if Dr. Coke had never been ordained, if our organization was a piece of fraud and villainy, to say nothing of the stupidity of Dr. Coke to hazard a publication of it both in England and America, of permitting Mr. Wesley to examine his Journal that contained an account of the whole transaction we should expect there would have been from him *some note of censure*. If the Doctor had assumed what Mr. Wesley did not intend, if the Methodists here had sanctioned that assumption and done under his name what he had never authorized, was it not his *duty* to proclaim the fraudulent transaction; and yet not a particle of evidence has or can be produced of Mr. Wesley's ever uttering a sentence of disapproval for Dr. Coke's exercise of Episcopal powers claimed by virtue of an ordination received from him; not a word of condemnation for the Methodists organizing an *Episcopal Church*. When Mr. Wesley was censured by his brother and the high church party for exercising Episcopal prerogatives in the consecration of Dr. Coke and others, he never denied doing it, but sought to defend himself upon the ground that he had not exceeded his right.

Such is a brief statement of the facts in the case. And, with such facts how visionary for Mr. Bolles to think of making the world believe, that Mr. Wesley never intended to ordain Dr. Coke—that all this was nothing more than a *token* of his *blessing*—that he called a Conference of his preachers at Leeds for the purpose of consulting on the propriety of so *grave* a matter as *blessing* some preachers for America—that he appointed a meeting for *blessing* them—invited other *ordained* ministers to assist him in *blessing* them—executed a certificate certifying to the fact, that with the assistance of other ordained ministers he had thus *blessed* and by thus *blessing* had set apart Dr. Coke to the great work of *blessing* others—that as collateral testimony of the fact he wrote a Circular to his brethren in North America, in which he vindicates his *right* to *bless* and send them ministers and mentions the names of those he had thus *blessed* and sent—that the forms of ordination Mr. Wesley sent over were intended only as forms of *blessing*—that although these ministers in coming here declared themselves *ordained*, and one claimed to have been by Mr. Wesley invested with Episcopal powers, and organized a

Methodist *Episcopal* Church, and established an *Episcopal* form of Church Government, yet, such was the *stupidity* or *knavery* of Mr. Wesley he never charged them with having in these things, gone contrary to his instructions or claimed more than he intended! And after having attempted to sustain such an extraordinary issue with the no less extraordinary evidence that we have considered, what vanity for the Rector to conclude his "examination" with "*Quod erat demonstrandum*"!!! What, I ask in sober earnest has his "examination" demonstrated, but his *egotism*, his *ignorance*, and his *folly*. As well might he attempt to form a "*Quod erat demonstrandum*" on the wildest vagary the human mind ever conceived as to demonstrate his present issue with the Methodists. When his principles of successional exclusiveness and prelatical domination, "that more efficient support of Monarchy than a standing army," shall have found a home in the hearts of this people—when "**THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**," "**THE AMERICAN CHURCH**," shall have seated herself upon the Throne of State, and become, what her title imports, the established hierarchy of the land—when Papal Bulls shall interdict the freedom of the press and the rights of conscience—when *intellectual* gloom, the hand-maid of civil and religious Monarchy, shall have shut out the light of knowledge from the people's mind—when the fires of the inquisition shall have burned our Bibles and consumed the records of the past—when the rack or guillotine shall have taken the life of the last Hebrew that dares to advocate a *spiritual* Christianity—when the community shall become satisfied with *Latin Masses* and a *Wafer God*—when the last drop of Puritan blood shall have been poured out—when the myrmidons of a Papal Pontiff, to howl forth his anathemas and excommunications, shall hold the balance of power—when *Imperial Despotism*, instead of Liberty, shall be inscribed upon our country's seal—when age has blotted from memory's leaf the doings and the virtues of our fathers, then, and not till then, may he hope to succeed in fixing the stamp of idiocy or knavery upon the venerated names of Wesley, of Coke, of Asbury, and their associates—then may he hope to sustain his present issue with the Methodists. But this day *shall not* come. The age of prelatical domination *is past*. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Its days are numbered and will nigh finished. It was the Kingly protection—the Church corruption—the intellectual darkness amid ages of night that gave to it its former colossal greatness. But the light of the Reformation dawned, and all the patronage the proudest governments on earth could give preserved it not from ruinous decay. Its glory was eclipsed. Its arm of power palsied, and at this hour, it is like Sampson grinding at the Mill and like the blinded Nazarite will fall by its suicidal act. The night of intellect-

tual and moral darkness has gone not to return. The morning of a new era has dawned. The spirit of civil and religious tolerance is filling the land, and the spirit of our God is moving the mass of mind. Thousands upon thousands are becoming converted from sin and *formalism* to holiness and a *spiritual* religion. A struggle between these adverse powers there *may* be; a struggle there *will* be. It may be like the meeting of adverse comets, the shock may convulse the world, but the result is certain; the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it; the "man of sin" shall be slain, the old Dragon shall be bound and cast into the bottomless pit to torment the people of God no more. Light shall prevail over darkness—knowledge over ignorance—spirit over form—freedom over despotism, and truth over error. The "Quod erat demonstrandum" of Mr. Bolles shall be as the wifes of the Philistines, the house upon the sand which the force of truth shall sunder and demolish, and the names and the deeds of these servants of God shall be had in grateful remembrance when the bodies of their calumniators shall have mouldered in the dust and their names perished from the memory of man. Their spirits shall look down from their mansions above upon a Ministry and a Church which they have organized, and while they see it spreading over the face of the earth; the desert blossoming as the rose; Ethiopia stretching out her hands to God; the Celestial Empire receiving the light of divine truth; savage tribes and Pagan nations throwing away their superstition, their barbarism, their gods, and becoming enlightened and Christianized through its instrumentality; they shall rejoice for what they *did* and *suffered* in *maturing* and *executing* plans which have resulted in the salvation of so many souls—shall rejoice that they were counted worthy to suffer reproach for the cause of Christ, and while they shall ascribe the honor and glory of all to that God by whom they were supported and the work crowned with success, thousands as they land on those shores and breathe an atmosphere untainted by the poison of *envy*, shall hail them as the honored instruments under God of their eternal salvation! *They shall shine as stars forever and ever!*

APPENDIX.

BATAVIA, Aug. 7th, 1843

REV. ALLEN STEELE:—

Dear Sir—We cheerfully respond to your note, requesting a statement of the reasons which induced the Leader's Meeting of St. John's Church, on the 25th of July, 1842, to request you to deliver a few sermons disabusing the public mind from the aspersions and vituperations *privately* circulated in this vicinity against the Methodist E. Church and her administrations. In doing this, it is altogether proper and right to state the origin and circumstances connected with the unfortunate controversy, which the proceedings of the Rev. James A. Bolles, the Rector of St. James' Church in this village, has so unnecessarily gotten up, between the Methodists and Protestant Episcopalians in Batavia. In giving you this statement we shall avoid all argument on the controversy or reference to Mr. Bolles' book "The Episcopal Church Defended," save so far as its statements and admissions refer to our action, as the Leaders Meeting of St. Johns' Church. We shall do this temperately and calmly, but firmly: and, in making references, shall give names, where we know them, as connected with the facts we state. We shall not complain that Mr. Bolles has written a book, in which severe allusions are made to us: as such a work has been more than insinuated, by some of the Rectors' eulogizers in our village papers, was needed to substantiate "The Church:" we are content to have a little dirt cast on us for so laudable a purpose.

We have adopted the above mentioned course, as the only one consistent with a manly justification of ourselves, in calling for those Sermons. Besides, Methodism, in her official acts, has never skulked behind anonymous and irresponsible pamphlets; or, done that in the dark, which she feared to avow in the noon-day. Methodism, in all her arrangements, has most emphatically developed her principles as identified with the free institutions of the United States: for proof of this, it is only necessary to state, the impressive fact, that her increase has more than kept pace with the unparalleled energies of the nation; and the ad-

vance of Methodism has always been, in this government, the vanguard of civilization. The untiring zeal and energy of her ministry and membership have given new tone to spiritual religion throughout the country; and broken down the old shackles of ecclesiastical establishments, and illustrated the Apostolic truism that Religion flourishes best unsupported by any legal or statutory provisions for her ministry.

St. John's Church, for which the undersigned composed the Leaders meeting at the time Mr. Bolles circulated the offensive and anonymous pamphlets against Methodism in this community, was, as Mr. Bolles says on page 15 of his book, erected under very favorable auspices. We thought, at the time, under the favorable sensibilities of the Rector: it assuredly had the good wishes, as well as the co-operation, of the greater portion of his Parishioners. Indeed we supposed of them all. Such feelings were reciprocated fully towards St. James', and all her interests. Nor, would this harmony, but for the action of Mr. Bolles, have been interrupted. It scarcely could have been, had he practised upon the principles of Christian love and charity, so broadly spread over the pages of his "*Episcopal Church Defended.*" Had the injunction of the Apostle "Study to be quiet and mind your own business" formed even a minor feature in Mr. Bolles philosophy, it would hardly have been possible to have got up such a lamentable state of feeling, between two congregations, as he has done between those of St. James' and St. Johns' in Batavia.

We felt that Methodism approximated so near to Protestant Episcopalianism; her doctrines and articles of faith were so closely assimilated to theirs, that we saw no ground for inharmonious collisions between us:—we did not expect that the well known irritable temperament of Mr. Bolles, (for however calm and self-possessed the Rector may be on paper, he is rather inflammable, in contact with opposition) would have been his sole monitor on the occasion of his displeasure at the prosperity of St. Johns'. It was therefore matter of surprise as well as of deep regret, when early in the winter and spring of 1842 it was whispered that pamphlets aspersing the Methodist Ministry and her Sacraments were in secret circulation in this vicinity. This gave us earnest intimation that our prosperity was unsatisfactory to some private prejudice or other: nothing had been done by any of us which should have stirred the ire of the Rector, or interrupted the harmony of the community.

While the obloquy on our institutions was in this private and insidious manner being spread through this vicinity, it was announced, in the *Christian Advocate* and *Journal of New-York*, that a similar proceeding was going on in New England, and that Doct. George Peck, Editor of the *Methodist Quarterly* at our Book-

room, was about answering a slanderous pamphlet styled "Tracts for the People, No. 4" against Methodism in these United States, and connecting its distribution with the action of the Protestant E. Church in the State of New-York; it occurred to one of us (Mr. Lowber) that the whispered circulation about Batavia, was the same matter. He meeting, soon after, the Rector of St. James in company with Mr. William A. Seaver, partner in the book store of Wm. Seaver & Son of this village, Mr. Lowber enquired of Mr. Seaver if they had in his book store any of "Tracts for the People, No. 4" for sale. Mr. Seaver replied they had not. Mr. Lowber hardly crediting the fact, now so thoroughly proved, that a portion of the Protestant E. Church (that part which put forth the doctrine that the Bishop and Clergy constitute the Church) had descended from their former elevated position, as the Church of Christ against which even the gates of Hell could not prevail, to the arena of anonymous and defamatory pamphlets against other denominations of Christians, some hesitation was felt in making the like enquiry of Mr. Bolles as to his knowledge of the Tract: But, as the notice in the Advocate and Journal had connected the name of his Diocesan with the introduction of the tract, the enquiry was made, in the second place of him whether *he* had any of them. Mr. B. acknowledged he had some, and gave Mr. L. one, but, as the book of Mr. Bolles' states, with considerable reluctance; for Mr. L. spoke of its supposed character as unworthily gotten up, and more unworthily distributed. The contents fully justified Mr. L.'s expectations: besides, the system of secrecy in assailing the Methodists would necessarily be broken up, and the proceedings of "the Church" exposed; hanging her up on the dilemma of either doing secretly what she was ashamed to do openly, or of flinching from doing what, is assumed by her as duty.

Doct. Peck's reply to Tracts for the People No. 4 having asserted that, at a respectable Book Store in New-York, where he had seen that tract for sale, on enquiry for one he was told "the Bishop of the Western Diocese of this State had just taken all they had on hand for the use of his diocese." That Bishop was, and is the Right Rev. William H. De Lancey, and that book store was, and is now known to have been the house of Messrs. Sword & Stamford, in Broadway, New-York,—the acknowledged depository and head quarters for all publications administering to the distinctive features and pretensions of the Protestant E. Church in the State of New-York: Yea, is more identified with her peculiar views and claims, as "The Church," than is, even the Book Store of the Messrs. Seaver's in this village, with the wishes and plans of the Rector of St. James. These facts in the opinion of the Leaders meeting justified their naming as one ground of their request, the asserted action of the Bishop in

the case, and as Mr. Bolles admitted he had distributed at least two, his name was appropriately added as the distributor of the slander.

We learn, now, from Mr. Bolles' book, page 16, his original number was half a dozen; now supposing the one handed Mr. Lowber was one of the six, five at least were parted with by the Rector, for he says "as my original number was but a half a dozen, they were soon distributed and I was obliged to send for a half dozen more, all I ever had."

That these publications were the enterprize of the Protestant E. Church, however much Mr. Bolles may pretend to the contrary, is undeniable. They were kept for sale at her recognized depositories for her peculiar publications; they were sold at her depository No. 28, Ann st. New-York, with her other Educational and Missionary and Tract Society Publications. It was there Mr. Lowber, one of the undersigned, procured through a friend some of "Tracts for the People No. 4." It is true, however, they were delivered under some of the same squirmings as to selling them to an unknown applicant, as was felt by Mr. Bolles to giving one to Mr. Lowber. We doubt not that they, at 28 Ann Street, as well as Mr. B. felt, it was a very small business, putting forth extracts from John Wesley's work directed and applied to an object utterly different than the one for which John Wesley wrote them. These tracts were thus distributed by a respectable Presbyter of that Church in this village; we believed and still believe the tracts were introduced through the agency of one of its most talented Bishops: the circumstances justified the Leaders meeting in noticing these assaults; and in calling for the defense of their Methodist institutions at the hands of their Pastor.

It is made matter of great complaint on the part of Mr. Bolles that the names of individuals were mentioned. This is not at all surprising to us, that an individual who had been pursuing a covert method of private attack, should protest against an open and manly defense. Nothing so natural as for the retailer of secret obloquy to writhe under the exposure of his conduct. What other course than the one adopted could the Leaders have taken—they were reprobating the secret proceedings of "the Church" as unbecoming her character and position among Christians—could they in taking measures of defense permit themselves to be influenced by unavowed motives? Could they, as the Apostle asserted some did, approve that which they condemned? why Methodism, having ever exhibited her defenses in broad day, would have disowned any other course! Her establishments send forth no anonymous aspersions on her sister denominations. She needs them not. What she controverts, in either the creeds or arrangements of others, she does it under

her own displayed standard. Never, no, never, under the cover of irresponsible and anonymous insinuation. We trust she will ever imitate the fearless and dauntless decision with which her founder, John Wesley ever met the English predecessors of the present American Calumniators of American Methodism.

One of the undersigned, Mr. Lowber, when in New-York, about the time of these developments, called at Messrs. Sword's & Stamford's to buy one of "Tract No. 4"—his visit was mainly to read the proprietors on the point of the Bishop's agency in the case. He was satisfied that Doct. Peck's statement was correct. But he was furnished with a tract. It was of a different edition from the one he had gotten from Mr. Bolles, so that two editions had been printed, and were being issued before our Leaders had taken any measures of defense. Allowing one dozen only to each Clergyman in the Protestant E. Church who co-operate in these measures, and thousands of copies would be requisite. This is on quite too great a scale for a mere "private enterprize" as Mr. Bolles would have us believe all such measures are.

Mr. Bolles says, page 14 of his book, that one certainly of the Leaders had been informed that Bishop De Lancey, on his then last visit to this place (Batavia, in 1842) had remarked that he had "*never seen or read* the tract at all." We presume this refers to a conversation between Mr. Lowber and Mr. William A. Seaver. In that conversation Mr. Seaver did not say, the Bishop had said he never *saw* or read the tract; but only, he had never *read* it. That, Mr. L. believed at the time, was correct as to the Bishop's declaration:—the Bishop's reading the tract had but little bearing on his introducing it into his Diocese—for assuredly, what was thought worthy of a second edition, had approved its acceptableness to Episcopalian; and what was kept for sale by Messrs. Swords and Stamford, and held for sale at the Depository No. 28 Ann street, New York, would certainly by the Bishop without a reading, be taken as administering to the good of his Diocese. Moreover, this version of the Bishop's remark is corroborated by a conversation held in Mr. L's presence in the railroad cars, on his return home, in which conversation the distribution of this same tract No. 4 was being censured, to Mr. Morse of Canandaigua, by a member of the legal profession of that place. Upon Mr. L's alluding to the agency of Mr. De Lancey in the matter, Mr. Morse observed, he had heard the Bishop say then not long since, that he had never *read* the tract not that he "*had never seen it.*" Nothing else, it is presumed, was intended to have been disclaimed by the Bishop. What Mr. Bolles disclaims, for him, is *nothing worth*. It was at the time believed, and is still believed, that the character of Methodism, the character of the Leaders, as conservators of the Societies entrusted to them, demanded that their action, in those matters, should be

accompanied with a frank and explicit announcement of the reasons and necessities of a public defense of her institutions. To have made one, without a declaration whose attack they were forestalling, would have been as unwise as Mr. Bolles' conduct was illiberal; unless, indeed, it is assumed that the Protestant E. Church cannot be defended and maintained without the destruction of Methodism. That would be a marvelous position; especially as it, "The Church," is claimed to be exclusively Apostolic. We always supposed there were sound merits, in the ground-work of that Church, sufficient for her structure. Her Presbyters seem to doubt: and by their publications intimate alarm for her safety.

Notwithstanding Mr. Bolles, in various places in his book, predicates his positions on what he is pleased to term "the recklessness" of some of the Leaders of St. Johns, it is a very truth that the whole body, under the representation made to them, by Mr. Benjamin C. Page, of the wishes and feelings of Mr. Bolles, as *distinctly* expressed by the latter gentleman, disclaiming any wish or desire for a controversy with St. Johns' Church, and desiring that harmony should be cultivated and peace restored, did cordially accede to Mr. Bolles' views; and did suppose the excitement was to be suffered to die, and that war should cease. See page 20, of Mr. B's book. The Leaders of St. Johns were satisfied and prepared to cultivate peace and good will, presuming Mr. Bolles regretted the circulation of "Tracts for the People No. 4," and was sincere, when he told Mr. B. C. Page, he wished for "peace." We do not pretend to casuistry so profound as to be able to reconcile the language of Mr. Bolles, on page 20 of the "Defense," either with its own admissions or the facts of the case. Yet, some few weeks after, Mr. B. ordered on "Tracts for the People No. 5," and held them for sale at the Book store of the Meesrs. Seavers, in contravention of his expressed desires to Mr. B. C. Page, on which the Leaders had relied. Now tract No. 5 is in the same series with Tract No. 4—is by the same unknown Gentleman, we presume, of the Protestant E. Church, styled in No. 4 as "D. S. P"—in No. 5 as "P. D. S."—Tract No. 5 avows its design "to be against not only Presbyterians, ordinarily so called, but also against Baptists, *Methodists*, &c. Mr. Bolles attempts, on page 20, to insinuate that the assumed truce was a mere "inference, which he wont deny as he wants no controversy with any of these gentlemen." This evasion of having departed from his distinctly expressed wishes, is quite of a piece with the origin of the difficulty. But Mr. Bolles attempts another account, why he ordered on Tract No. 5, page 21. He saw "an advertisement in the Churchman, that some Tracts had been published on the 'Christian Ministry'—in sending for these books, the book-seller was requested to send some of those"—and this

Tract No. 5 was sent. This means the book-seller sent Tract No. 5 as filling an order for Tracts on the "Christian Ministry." The general heading of the Tract No. 5, as printed on its title page, is "Tracts for the People No. 5"—then "Tract for the People No. 4," is also on the "Christian Ministry." It is a nice point to decide, whether Mr. Bolles' weak attempt to justify the order is less or more *ingenious*, than the acumen of the Agent, sending them, is *astute* in divining the wants and wishes of the Rector. Both are certainly remarkable in their way.

We come now to the great justifying reason for Mr. Bolles' distributing tract No. 4. What is it? The distribution was made "to his own people." Mr. Bolles don't say wherefore! Oh no! Did Mr. Bolles doubt the stability of his "own people" in Episcopalianism, that they required the appliances of aspersions and obloquy on Methodism to strengthen their faith in their own professions? Does Mr. Bolles insinuate that his flock were of doubtful stamp?—such an apology is folly in the extreme. How much more unbecoming would it have been to have frankly avowed the object: a willingness to build up St. James by the ruins and aspersions on the character of St. Johns. We will suggest a sufficient motive in the Rector, at least in some of the instances of the distribution, as those the earlier ones, to sow dissension in families where some members thereof were Methodists while the heads were Episcopilians—hence tract No 4 was handed to Richard Smith, Esq.'s family, to PIr. John Thorps' family. Did Mr. Bolles, will any man suppose that he doubts of Mr. Smith's or Mr. Thorps's stedfastness in Episcopalianism? All who know Richard Smith or John Thorp know their profession of Episcopalianism is as genuine, as their whole lives are ornaments to St. James' and to Christianity: without reproach or suspicion. Ah, but some of the younger branches of these families are Methodists. A fire-brand there might be available to some purpose. It was tried early, long before the Leaders of St. Johns dreamed that Mr. Bolles' profession of friendship towards St. Johns was an outside show. And while St. James' was undergoing repairs, did not St. Johns freely accord to Mr. Bolles the use of their pulpit, and was it not freely used by the Rector? To have done otherwise would have done violence to what we admit was due to the kindness and friendship of Mr. Bolles' congregation.

One other point remains to be investigated and we shall have done. It is an important point, made so by Mr. Bolles' statements. It is the placing of "tracts for the People No. 4," in the Messrs. Seavers' Book store for sale. Mr. Bolle says, in his book, page 13, "Let this fact be remembered, that the Methodist placed Tract No. 4, on Methodism, in the Book store, and not Bishop De Lancy or myself, as many have been led to suppose." And on page 175 the assertion is repeated, but restricting it to *himself* or *his* agency. The induction of Bishop De Lancy's name in the first statement, page 13, is entirely gratuitous measure of the Rector, and can only refer itself to his unfeigned inclination to mystify; let it pass. We never heard of it until Mr. Bolles announced it. The assertion then, by Mr. Bolles, is that the Methodist placed Tract No. 4 in the Book store for sale. He makes this a great point; he says when it is materially contradicted, see page 175, "I shall be compelled to bring forward my proof." We all, without reserve, deny that Leaders or Methodists placed Tract No. 4 for sale or distribution in any or shape or manner at the Book store in this village as Mr. Bolles and we further say we have no doubt that the Tract No. 4 was placed by Mr. Bolles himself, either directly or indirectly. The ~~and~~ reasons for thus believing: When Mr. Bolles' book announced, in his statements, one of them, Mr. Lowber, who had procured the tract No. 4 from the Depository, 28 Ann street, New York, as

(but of the second edition, or that edition without the words "Copy-right secured" on its title page,) for the purpose of furnishing our Methodist friends with a sight of what aspersions were contained in the pamphlets put forth by the Protestant E. Church ~~against~~ Methodism, and having no knowledge of their having been put in the Book store for sale or distribution, enquired of those implicated by Mr. Bolles' statements: the result was, no one had done as was affirmed. Mr. Lowber then called on Mr. William A. Seaver to ascertain whether any of the Methodists had left Tract No. 4 at their Book store for sale—Mr. Seaver replied *they had not*—he admitted the tracts had been sold there. On a subsequent occasion, Mr. Lowber asked Col. Seaver, the father, if he knew *who had put* those tracts in his Store for sale. The Colonel said he did not; he had not taken much interest in the matter. Mr. Lowber then asked Mr. Wm. A. Seaver, casually meeting him along the street, whether his recollection would enable him to say *who had placed* tract No. 4 at his store for sale—he answered very cordially, he really could not, evidencing a strong disinclination, as he several times before had done, to take part in such controversies.

Mr. Bolles, finding such a call for them as to require a fresh supply after the exhaustion of his first half dozen—might very naturally think the Book store the more appropriate channel of the distribution; as we dare say he felt it a little incompatible with the sacredness of a Minister's study—and the matter had become the "theme of conversation in Stores and Offices," therefore any further secrecy was idle—the thing was abroad, connected with his name, too—therefore, why hesitate? A better reason than these for believing Mr. Bolles himself placed or procured those to be placed in the Book store for sale, is found in the fact, that Mr. Benjamin C. Page bought them there and ~~was told Mr. Bolles placed them there for sale.~~ Mr. Jacob Conger, had seen them there for sale, and when afterwards enquiring for one, was told "*Mr. Bolles had taken them away.*" The mystification, if there be any, may be found in the fact that Mr. Benjamin C. Page had placed the *answer of Dr. Peck to tract No. 4*, together with two other pamphlets by Doct. Bangs, on other subjects, in the Store for sale. These were afterwards withdrawn at the instance of the Messrs. Seavers, who desired to be neutral. Mr. Bolles was well aware of what pamphlets Mr. Page had placed in the Store, as, from his note to Mr. Page dated Sept. 21, 1842 to get them, Mr. Bolles says, "Will Mr. Page be so kind as to send to me Dr. Peck's reply to tract No. 4, also the two tracts by Doctor Bangs. Batavia, Sept. 21, 1842." Signed, "J. A. BOLLES."

But a conclusive proof that none of the Leaders or Methodists placed those tracts there for sale, is found in the fact that the "tracts for the People No. 4," bought at the Book store, as appears by one, now before us, gotten there by D. M. Seaver, has the words "*Copy-right secured*" on its title page—those words are on the *one given by Mr. Bolles to Mr. Lowber*—but those words *are not on* the tracts procured by Mr. Lowber from New York, and of course those sold at the Book store could not have been placed there from that lot. Mr. Bolles' tracts had those words on the title page. To all unprejudiced minds it must be apparent the tracts must have come to the Book store through Mr. Bolles directly, or indirectly. Therefore in the *Latin flourish* of the Rector, *quod erat non strandum, nos dicemus demonstrandum est.*

JOHN LOWBER,	STEPHEN TUTTLE,
THO'S. M'CULLEY,	B. C. PAGE,
COP CONGER,	ONES PAGE,
LEVI BARNER.	

